

THE STUDENT WORLD

A quarterly magazine published at 13 Rue Calvin, Geneva
by the World's Student Christian Federation

PHILIPPE MAURY, *Editor*

VOLUME XLIX

Second Quarter, 1956

NUMBER 2

Peace

Our readers might legitimately ask, not why *The Student World* is publishing an issue on peace, but why it has not done so much earlier. Peace has been a key word since the beginning of the crisis between the Western and communist worlds. It has been both a political slogan used by each camp against the other, and also the deepest and most genuine concern of almost all men everywhere in the world. Indeed, it has been the tragedy of recent years that anyone who spoke about peace was immediately suspected of making political propaganda, or at least of having fallen prey to it. Even the churches have had to face this danger. When they spoke about the peace of God which passes all understanding, there were men outside of the Church, and even sometimes within it, who wondered whether this was not the first step towards supporting either communism or American imperialism. It is not surprising, therefore, that churches, Student Christian Movements, all sorts of Christian groups and individuals have been so extremely careful in everything they have said about peace. I remember discussions at an ecumenical conference about the use of the words "peaceful co-existence"; they finally were rejected, not because there was disagreement about the ends to be sought, but because during the years of political struggle these words had become in some way the property of one of the camps. Substitute words were used — I do not even remember what they were — but I wonder if something of our thinking was not lost because of this taboo on words. I wonder now what the Church may have

lost because of the many taboos on the word "peace", how many opportunities we Christians may have lost in recent years because we did not dare to speak about peace regardless of these taboos.

It seems to me that it is part of our condition as Christians in the midst of a sinful world, part of our own sinful condition, that, whatever we say, we have to use words with a particular connotation. If we use secular terms, they will bear the connotation of secular ideologies, of historical cultures, of political propaganda. If we use biblical or theological terms, they may be unintelligible to non-Christians, and they will always carry, not only the riches of the work of the Holy Spirit, but so often the dead weight of the unfaithfulness of the churches. Shall we then remain silent? Of course not. We are called to speak, on behalf of our Lord, the living Word of God. This means that we must at all times choose carefully the words we use and always give the explanation which may help men to understand them. But we must never reject a word which carries something essential of God's revelation simply because it is a dangerous word. If we can find a really good modern substitute which does not alter the biblical meaning, let us take it. If not, let us stick to the biblical word and try to explain it. And, since we are dealing here with "peace", is there any modern substitute for this word? On the contrary, as I said in the beginning, peace is one of the most modern words, one of those words which carry meaning for the men in the streets and fields, as well as for the philosophers, politicians and theologians. The concern for peace is perhaps the most universal of all concerns in our atomic age. Let us then speak of peace.

Conversations on peace

As a matter of fact, we have tried in the Federation in recent years to speak about peace. I do not think we have achieved very much, and I am sure we have been misunderstood in many ways. I would like to take this opportunity to say something about the conversations on peace which Federation members had in 1955 with members of the International Union of Students. I think it was in 1950 that I was first asked by IUS

representatives why it was that the Federation had refused to sign the Stockholm Appeal for peace. Did this mean that we were not in favour of peace ? I tried to say what I as a Christian believed and what I tried to do ; I explained why I preferred to speak about peace as a Christian rather than within the context of a secular appeal. As a result of this discussion, the IUS representative with whom I spoke told me of his concern that several members of our two organizations might have a similar conversation on peace. The Federation Officers, meeting shortly afterwards, studied the official invitation we had received from IUS. We were hesitant at first. It was the time of the climax of the Korean crisis. The IUS was generally considered as a communist or communist-controlled organization. What should we say ? We answered, and this answer was later confirmed by our General Committee, that

... this invitation received from IUS greatly helps the Federation to face the urgency of the present international situation by compelling it to make a practical decision, but the real problem lies at a deeper level. There are growing criticisms against the tendency in the ecumenical movement which would lead it away from the position of "a third way" towards an association with one of the two big powers. This tends to provoke a certain amount of disquiet in some quarters of the Federation. The question may be asked whether the unity of the Federation is not endangered by present political events. This certainly calls for thinking, study and action. (On the other hand) ... it is a matter of Christian witness always to be ready to speak to those who ask us to do so, and especially in present conditions, conversation with an organization which represents primarily students in communist-controlled areas is a real way of keeping the door open between the two hostile parts of the world, while refusing it would in some way contribute to building up the iron curtain. While the possible results of such a conversation should be looked at realistically, as Christians we should always be open to the possibility of what we call a miracle, that is to say, the grace of God working through us in ways we could not reasonably expect.

Practical difficulties led to a considerable delay before these conversations with IUS could take place. We held a small meeting in 1953 to plan for the consultation we had in mind,

but it was not until 1955 that we were able to bring together for three days in Vienna, Austria, some thirty representatives of IUS and of the Federation. We had agreed that no official publicity should be given to our conversations, in which each participant would speak in his own name without committing in any way the organization he represented. As a matter of fact, this rule was so well observed that very few people heard about our conversations, and perhaps because of this they lost some of their significance. The following is the only statement which was issued regarding the meeting :

On February 2, 3 and 4, 1955, students and student leaders from Australia, Austria, Burma, Britain, China, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, France, German Democratic Republic, India, Indonesia, Lebanon, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Reunion Island, Senegal, Switzerland, Uruguay, the United States, Russia and Viet Nam met in Vienna, Austria.

They discussed together "The positive meaning of peace, with special reference to cultural and educational development and the responsibility of the student community".

The meeting was organized on the initiative of the International Union of Students and of the World's Student Christian Federation, but these two organizations were not officially represented in these discussions and every participant spoke for himself. The purpose of the meeting was to enable the participants to meet with one another, to explain their own convictions and to understand those of others. No resolutions were intended or passed.

During the conversations, there appeared not only differences of political, philosophical and religious convictions, but the feeling that more needs to be done to make students more conscious of their responsibility as members of universities, and more actively concerned for the problems of peace between different nations and regimes. The conversations were carried on in a friendly spirit and showed that such contacts can make an effective contribution towards better understanding and towards reducing international tension which, in large measure, grows from isolation between nations as well as between individuals.

Participants expressed their views about the means to avoid the catastrophe which atomic war would be ; on different grounds, Christians and non-Christians opposed it as collective suicide. There was also discussion about the possibility for countries and individuals of diverse cultures

and systems to have relations with one another, other than hatred, fear and violence. All agreed that it is necessary for them to live together in peace.

The need was recognized for constant and persevering efforts to bring about among members of different societies and nations a real understanding based on knowledge of each other's deepest personal convictions.

"For the sake of witness"

Time has now passed, and I would like to say something more, not on behalf of the Federation, but simply as one of the participants in these conversations, about what they meant for me, and I know for several others.

In planning for this meeting, the Federation Executive Committee said :

Our primary objective is to speak about Jesus Christ with our fellow students as fellow human beings. Such a conversation must use an understandable language. In this particular attempt we are willing to use the language of peace in relation to political tensions, because we believe that Jesus Christ is Prince of Peace and that this affects both our peace with God and men's relations with one another. We do not believe it is an easy or obvious matter so to speak of Christ... Such an attempt requires risk and faith. It is possible and even likely that these conversations will be judged solely or primarily in respect to their political meaning and more especially their meaning in the world of student politics. With regard to the latter, we intend neither to intervene by this means in student politics nor to endanger such relationships as we may enjoy among other international student organizations. For the sake of witness we intend to maintain communication with all. With regard to the possible place of such conversations in the general political situation, we intend to maintain human contact in obedience to our command to witness regardless of the favourableness of the timing of such contacts. The permanent obligation laid on us by Jesus Christ and the universal character of the Federation make such considerations subordinate... We are aware that misunderstandings may arise about these conversations; misunderstandings would also arise if we refused to converse.

Some misunderstandings did arise, although, as I have said, the lack of publicity considerably reduced them. Our purpose

to speak about peace "for the sake of witness" was perhaps achieved, though God alone can say whether or not His Word was heard during this meeting. I remember some moments in our sessions, and even more some personal conversations, during which I had the impression that an opportunity had been given us, not to talk about our political opinions or even our deepest human convictions, but to express, in terms of the concern which had brought us all together in Vienna, something of the love of Jesus Christ for His mankind and the hope we have of another day when everything will be new and there will be peace forever. I remember the moving moment when one of our communist friends told us that for the first time he had been compelled to look at himself in an effort to discover what he was ultimately concerned about, what meaning he thought his life had. To my mind, such occasions provide abundant evidence that such conversations are not only useful but our pressing Christian duty.

Nothing human can be foreign to us

On such occasions one of the essential conditions for real encounter is, of course, that the Christian participants come to the meeting with the right moral and spiritual attitude; not with the desire to win points in a political argument, but rather to speak with people with whom we know we disagree, but whom we nevertheless wish to meet. We must come with a desire to learn as well as to speak. I have said above that our fundamental concern is Christian witness. I am convinced that witness is most often made possible by encounter between men, and that without such encounter witness rarely takes place. This becomes particularly clear when we meet as Christians with people holding a faith other than our own. To bring them our message, we must be interested in what they believe, we must try to understand why they believe it; beyond all our criticisms, however radical and valid they may be, of their convictions, we must have a fundamental sympathy for them as persons; we must be able to recognize the dignity of man in the very way in which they try to live up to their convictions, whether right or wrong. One word encompasses all this:

openness. It seems to me that the secret of evangelism is to be open to everything human; to say in the words of the philosopher, but in another sense, "Nothing human is foreign to me." Nothing human can be foreign to us Christians because in Jesus Christ the whole of mankind, with its greatness and also its weakness, is present. When we meet communists or other non-Christians with this openness, something happens for which we cannot really account: the mystery of the presence, between two men confronting each other and trying to speak together, of a third Invisible Person who makes the dialogue meaningful by adding His own words in His own way.

I do not think there is much more to say about our conversations with IUS members in Vienna. We spoke about peace, and we Federation members tried to say what we believed about peace and about the ways it might be achieved in the political arena. What is interesting, and perhaps very significant, is that we often disagreed with one another, and thus demonstrated to IUS members that Christianity should never be identified with any political alignment or front. We spoke about peace, and while we certainly said a number of valid things about it, we probably also talked a lot of nonsense. IUS delegates also spoke some truth along with much nonsense. Frankly, I do not think that we found any new solution to the problems of world peace, and from this point of view our conversation may look like a sheer waste of time and money. But I would say that even from the perspective of our concern for political peace, our effort was not in vain.

Perhaps the basic impression of all participants in these conversations — and I suppose all who have had similar experiences will make the same judgment — was the immense difficulty we had understanding one another. Apart from linguistic difficulties with which interpreters had to struggle, apart even from the different organizational traditions in IUS and the Federation, which led each side to make statements of a kind with which the other was frankly bored, beyond all these secondary difficulties, was the fact that we were meeting as strangers in the deepest sense of that word (even delegates from the same country but with different faiths or ideologies had difficulty understanding one another). We were people who

had learned to think, to judge, to love and to hope different things, and who had almost never met with those who think, judge, love and hope in other ways. It was a very long time before we began, before we barely began, to understand something of one another. It was interesting that at the end of these three days, as I was speaking with an IUS friend, he suggested that if we ever held another conversation of this kind it should not be in a big city, where we were constantly distracted from our conversations, and that it should last at least a week: our meeting was just beginning to be fruitful, when we had to leave.

Opportunities for witness

I am sure that if thirty students or student leaders, some of them holding communist convictions, others the Christian faith, others perhaps no faith at all, were able to spend three days together and to gain a little understanding of one another, something very significant has been achieved for peace among men. If we judge it in terms of big power conferences or hydrogen bombs, it looks ridiculously insignificant. If we remember that the greatest threat to peace in our day is fear, which is usually based primarily on mutual ignorance, then our small effort in Vienna was valid, even from the point of view of political effectiveness. Above all, the purpose and justification for such conversations must be found in Christian witness. It is only in so far as these conversations are regarded as an opportunity for witness and in so far as we are willing to bear the burden of Christian witness in them, that we can, or rather must, go ahead with them, whatever the misunderstandings, the criticisms, the dangers involved in doing something which the world does not welcome.

In the coming period the Federation will certainly face similar challenges and be offered similar opportunities for contact with, and witness to, members of the university world who do not share our faith. The International Union of Students has already offered to organize in 1957 another conversation, this time on our conception of the university and of its role in society. This will be an opportunity for witness. We are

planning to organize in 1958, together with Pax Romana, the international organization of Roman Catholic students, and we hope with the support of UNESCO, a round-table conference on the theme, "Men in the University and in Society". All international university organizations will be invited to participate in this discussion, together with some of the best-known figures of the academic world. This will be an opportunity for witness. UNESCO constantly offers us occasions to meet and speak with people of the most varied cultural and intellectual horizons. This is an opportunity for witness. The Federation sponsors World University Service, and thus tries to manifest Christian love through student relief, and also to explain why we have this concern, to say that we wish to help students because Jesus Christ loves them. This is an opportunity for witness. In all these cases witness is our calling, and we must not ignore open doors. In all these cases we also have the possibility of contributing to a more real understanding among men, and thus of strengthening the cause of peace.

* * *

This number of *The Student World* on "Peace" includes some theological articles and some political ones. We have tried to select authors with a wide range of opinions about war and peace, but we have not tried to make a synthesis of these opinions. What is significant is that there are within the Church so many people who, while equally concerned for peace, sometimes differ so greatly about the methods for bringing it about, and that these people, who disagree on one of the most fundamental and burning problems of our day, nevertheless wish to remain together in the same Church and to struggle side by side in the ranks of the ecumenical movement. It is true, as has often been said, that the ecumenical movement is in our day the greatest force for peace in the world and one of the most genuine signs of God's eternal peace. Let us beware of finding in that conviction and hope any reason for self-righteousness and complacency, but rather a challenge to fight for peace together with all men who are willing to share in this battle.

PH. M.

Jesus Christ the Reconciler

RICHARD SHAULL

Estrangement is one of the most disturbing realities of the modern world. It manifests itself especially in three areas of our life.

1. *In our estrangement from God and from "self"*. Most men today are not very conscious of their alienation from God. But how else shall we explain our sense of lostness, our feeling that we are living in a world without signposts, our consciousness of guilt and our unsatisfied longing for transcendence? Augustine saw, in such phenomena, the restlessness of the human heart that had not found rest in God; Tillich speaks of them as expressions of Western man's "self-estrangement from his Source". With alienation from God has come man's alienation from "self", his inability to answer the simple but mysterious question, "Who am I?"

2. *In our estrangement from one another*. In this regard we usually think of the misunderstandings and conflicts evident today between representatives of different races, classes and ideologies. But I wonder if there is not a more insidious, though less evident, manifestation of this estrangement — the difficulties we have of establishing real personal relationships with one another, of communicating with others about our most serious concerns.

I recently participated in a conversation between American and non-American students sponsored by the SCM of Philadelphia. The foreign students began by criticizing most strongly the unwillingness of American students, even in Christian groups, to enter into real personal relationships with them. Soon an American student remarked: "This problem is much more serious than you imagine. Our inability to establish personal relationships with foreign students is just one expression of the radical breakdown at this point which is manifest in all areas of university life today."

3. *In the estrangement and conflict so evident in the structure of our modern society*. The orders of our collective life have

always been areas of misunderstanding and struggle. Today, however, we seem to be more aware of these conflicts and less hopeful of overcoming them. Two factors may help to explain this. On the one hand, the technical development of our time has upset the stability which these structures knew in a former day. It has also done away with the relative isolation in which groups lived in the past and has brought them into direct physical contact with one another. On the other hand, the disintegration of personal life and human relations, which we now experience, has come precisely at the moment in which we most desperately need greater resources for overcoming the conflicts and tensions inevitable in the present situation.

Our age is characterized not only by estrangement but also by a growing sense of despair in the face of it. The more we become aware of its depths, the less confidence we have in finding a way out ; the more we strive to overcome it, the deeper becomes our involvement in it.

This is most clearly seen in our attempts to solve the problems of our collective life. Our generation has fought for noble causes — economic and political freedom, democracy, social justice — but victory has not healed the wounds of our society. The most perturbing example of this is found in communism. Never perhaps in human history have so many given so much for a cause which offered to bring about complete reconciliation in society. But the promise which the Marxist ideology held out has not been realized. The liquidation of the irreconcilables has not put an end to conflict. The harmonious state so long awaited has not come, but new and more potent forces of conflict have been set loose.

Are we then destined to become the victims of ever-growing despair, which will cut the nerve of action and hasten the final collapse of our civilization ? Or will each new generation, to avoid this end, create its own idols and sacrifice itself to them, only to end up in the inevitable disillusionment which they must offer ? These things may easily happen, unless our world can find a ground for hope in an entirely different direction — in the intervention in human affairs of a Power from Beyond which could, by a mighty act of reconciliation, change the human situation.

The relevance of Christian faith

If the problem of estrangement is such an acute one in our modern world, it is at this point that the relevance of the Gospel may be most severely tested. It is also here that the Church has an unusual opportunity to speak a relevant word, as Paul Tillich reminds us :

It is not an exaggeration to say that today man experiences his present situation in terms of disruption, conflict, self-destruction, meaninglessness and despair in all realms of life... The question arising out of this experience is not, as in the Reformation, the question of a merciful God and the forgiveness of sins ; nor is it, as in the early Greek Church, the question of finitude, of death and error, nor is it the question of the personal religious life or of the Christianization of culture and society. It is the question of a reality in which the self-estrangement of our existence is overcome, a reality of reconciliation and reunion, of creativity, meaning and hope ¹.

Does Christian faith offer us such a reality ? Can the Church incarnate that reality and communicate it to our world ? These are the questions which must concern us.

The Bible certainly has something to say about this matter. Its message may be a scandal to modern man, but it is certainly relevant to his situation. The first thing which the Bible does is to reinterpret radically the meaning of our experience of estrangement by affirming that its source is nothing less than man's revolt against the God who created him to live in a relationship of responsible obedience. Man did not follow that path. He followed strange gods, or made a god of himself. By so doing he altered completely his original relationship with God and brought judgment upon himself. He is now the object of God's wrath ; we are God's enemies (Romans 5 : 10).

From the biblical point of view, here is the one real source of the estrangement and conflict we experience in all realms of life. It is a poison which has permeated the whole body, bringing upon us an illness which we cannot cure. Man cannot set right the relationship he has broken, nor can he bring peace into a society in which the very foundations are false.

¹ *Systematic Theology*, Vol. I, p. 49.

But all this is a prelude to the Good News the Bible proclaims: "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself" (II Cor. 5 : 19). In and through Jesus Christ, an act of reconciliation has already taken place. The whole human situation has been changed. Our estrangement from God, self and neighbour has been overcome, and a new foundation for human relationships has been established. In face of the estrangement of our time, Christian faith does not offer us a distant hope but a present fact; not a human sentiment but an objective act of God. Reconciliation is not the goal towards which we strive, but the point from which we start in our understanding of the world and of our mission in it.

In any study of the biblical message of reconciliation, several facts stand out clearly.

I. JESUS CHRIST IS THE RECONCILER

St. Paul constantly speaks of Jesus Christ as the One who has brought about our reconciliation. By this he asserts at least three things which are of the utmost importance.

1. *Reconciliation is God's act.* It is not the result of man's striving but God's gift to us and to the world. The God-Man has reconciled us. Moreover, it is not the result of some impersonal event which took place entirely removed from time and history. Rather, it is the act of a personal God who has come into the world and to us personally in His own Son.

2. *God has reconciled us to Himself and to each other by suffering love.* When we are faced by disorder and confusion, we put our confidence in power as the means of straightening things out. And the more power man has, the more he tends to rely on it alone to establish order. God chose another way. Being the source of all power, He willed to reconcile the world to Himself by suffering love. He sent His Son to love, to suffer and to die in order to overcome our estrangement. Reconciliation has come through the death of Jesus Christ.

3. *The Reconciler is He who came and established His Kingdom and who will also come again to lead the world to its final consummation.* Reconciliation is a present fact. We have

already been reconciled to God and to each other. God has put all things under Christ's feet (Eph. 1 : 22). At the same time, the Reconciler is He who will come again to finish the work He started. In the interim, man is free to continue his rebellion. He can refuse to recognize and accept the new situation in which he lives and can live in open warfare with God and neighbour. But he is fighting a losing battle. He is striving against the fundamental fact of the universe : God's act of reconciliation. He is fighting against the Reconciler Himself, who will come again and have the final word.

II. JESUS CHRIST RECONCILED THE WORLD

St. Paul tells us that God's act of reconciliation affects the world. By this he does not mean primarily the order of nature, but rather the world of man which lives in rebellion against God. It is therefore not surprising that when he spells out the meaning of reconciliation, he refers to three specific areas.

1. *Man has been reconciled to God.* Man occupies the central place in God's creation. It was man who, by personal decision, revolted against God. Reconciliation, therefore, means that God has overcome this estrangement at its source, in the human heart.

For St. Paul, this is a very personal thing. It has to do, not with man in general, but with each one of us. He expresses its meaning in a wide variety of words and figures. God has given us peace, forgiveness, redemption. He has freed us from His wrath and accepted us as His adopted children. Consequently, we are new creatures, living a new life on an entirely different plane. For St. Paul this was so incredible and unexpected, that he was constantly waxing lyrical about it. It was so utterly unmerited and so far-reaching in its effects, that life became one perpetual hymn of gratitude and rejoicing.

2. *God has reconciled men to each other.* This is expressed most strikingly in Ephesians 2 : 14-17 :

For Christ is our living Peace. He has made a unity of the conflicting elements of Jew and Gentile by breaking down the barrier which lay between us. By His sacrifice He removed the hostility of the Law, with all its commandments and rules, and made in Himself out of the two, Jew and Gentile, One New Man, thus producing peace. For He reconciled both to God by the sacrifice of one Body on the Cross, and

by this act made utterly irrelevant the antagonism between them. Then He came and told both you who were far from God and us who were near that the war was over.

(Ephesians 2: 14-17, Phillip's translation.)

Because of what God has done, our relationships with one another have been entirely changed. Differences and problems may still exist between us, but in Jesus Christ they are "irrelevant". God has reconciled us to Himself; therefore, we are also reconciled to one another. God has forgiven and accepted us; we thus forgive and accept one another in Jesus Christ.

3. *God is reconciling the orders and powers of the world unto Himself.* Throughout the Pauline Epistles we find both hints and specific references to the universal and total nature of God's act of reconciliation. In Jesus Christ "all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell and through him to reconcile all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross" (Col. 1: 19-20). What happened in Christ affects the structures of man's life in the world. By the Cross God has made peace among men; through the Resurrection of Christ, God has put all dominions and powers under His feet. And He is at work in the world making real this reconciliation in the lives of men and in the structures of our common life. Alexander Miller has said that the concern of biblical faith is "the organization of the world around its true and authentic centre". This is what has happened in Jesus Christ. As men and peoples come to recognize and accept that fact, they make this reconciliation visible in the world.

III. THE CHURCH IS THE COMMUNITY OF RECONCILIATION

The Church is called to be the reconciled community, where that which God has wrought becomes an experienced reality. It is also called to be the reconciling community, cooperating with God in the "ministry of reconciliation" (II Cor. 5: 18).

1. It is in the Church that man's reconciliation with God is lived and proclaimed to the world. In the local church or the university Christian community, we are called to show that estrangement has been overcome, that we have been accepted by God and forgiven, that we have found in this event the secret of our selfhood and the basis for true life.

We cannot know this reconciliation without feeling the urge to proclaim it. To the degree that we live it and marvel at the wonder of its meaning for us and for the world, we must feel the urgency of Christian witness and grasp something of the spirit which moved St. Paul to pour out his life in missionary service, and to write of the greatness of this "mystery hidden for ages... but now made manifest", which he proclaimed to all, striving with all the energy which God mightily inspired within him (Col. 1 : 28-29).

2. It is in the Church that man's reconciliation with man appears in the world as both a present fact and a foretaste of the final reconciliation. Here men whom God has forgiven forgive each other. Here men show to the world that God has broken down all barriers between classes, races and nations, and has established peace. Such reconciliation may seem rare in the life of the Church, yet it is always going on. The theme of the recent Student Volunteer Movement Quadrennial was "Revolution and Reconciliation". More important than the speeches on the theme was the fact that reconciliation took place there. English, Dutch and Negro students from South Africa talked and prayed together and sought solutions for their problems. Students from Korea and Japan experienced reconciliation in a unique way, and in many small Bible study groups the estrangement between American and non-American students was overcome.

3. The Christian community is thrust into the very centres of conflict between men and into the struggles of society with this ministry of reconciliation. It knows that, because of Jesus Christ, the war is over. It knows that God is at work uniting all things in heaven and on earth in Jesus Christ. It therefore goes to the very centre of conflict and struggle, with the certainty that God will use its witness to bring men to see and accept their reconciliation with Him and with one another.

Such witness is costly. Perhaps that is why we do not see it more often in the Church as we know it today. Yet this is the mission which has been given to us. We accept it knowing that we are incapable of it. But we know that God uses our weakness and failure for His glory, and as we set quietly about our task of witness, God provides us with signs that our feeble efforts are being used by Him to carry forward His work of reconciliation in the world.

The Risk in the Democratic Search for Justice and Peace

HELEN HILL MILLER

In the midst of today's alarms, the attainment of justice and peace in the world seems very far off. Even the attainment of more justice and more peace seems weighted down with very great difficulties. Recognition of these difficulties, however, is a gain — at least as contrasted with the ignorant idealism of a generation ago. Now that world neighbourhood is measured in hours of flying time, the facts about the different segments of that neighbourhood are much more familiar. And the impossibility of justice and peace being attained by a single dramatic act becomes much clearer.

Everybody knows that local neighbourliness, local justice and peace, have to be brought into being act by act, particular by particular. More people today are becoming aware that this is equally true of world neighbourhood.

In many parts of today's world neighbourhood, the ends of justice and peace are being pursued through the technics of democracy, both in nations whose nationhood is recent and in older established countries. There is an essential risk in this approach of which its sponsors must be constantly aware. Let us look at this risk through a few examples.

Technics of democracy

The technics of democracy are a secular expression of the Christian principle that the individual matters. Their modern forms developed at the same time that the Reformation was emphasizing the individual's capacity to exercise his own reason and express his own faith. Hence their assumption that the individual can contribute his essential mite to what can then be taken as the will of the people.

But if this capacity for individual initiative makes the operation of democratic technics possible, it does not make it certain. For the individual can fail to act, can fail to contribute his essential mite, can default. And in case of default, that part of the world which is not concerned with pursuit of justice through democratic technics has a ready alternative. The alternative to nothing — to default — is never nothing ; something is always ready to take its place.

It is a truism — though nevertheless true — that the progress of democratic technics, as they are put to work in those parts of the world where peoples are expressing a newly-realized nationhood, is of crucial importance to all democratic countries everywhere. What is less often said is that the conditions of democracy worked out in these areas may prove to be the growing points of the democratic process, may lead to the creation of additional technics as new — and as fruitful — as those which were invented when the former American colonies turned themselves into states.

New democracies

To become instruments of justice and peace in the areas of new nationhood, the older technics must now adapt themselves and prove useful in areas where :

1. The people want to change from a simple agricultural society to a highly technical industrial society very fast. They want, right-away-very-soon, the high yields which the low-cost, large-scale production of such an economy makes possible for its members.

2. Bent on material improvement, these peoples are less concerned with their political than with their economic arrangements. Recently emerged from colonialism, they remember politics as an instrument of power and, on occasion, of oppression. They want to get away from power politics. They want to be left alone to work out their economic future. (This attitude has a strict parallel in the history of the United States, where its counterpart endured for over one hundred and fifty years, through the age of the generation now at maturity. If speeches

of American leaders of the 1920s like Senators Borah and Johnson were set in parallel columns with speeches by South Asian or African leaders like Nehru and Nasser, paragraphs could be exchanged without the sense being altered.)

3. Because of the speed with which history has sucked these countries from the periphery into the centre of events, there is a great lack of members of an urban middle class, from whom, in slower developing democracies, were drawn both the economic personnel to man the new enterprises and the political personnel to staff the middle levels of government. For that reason, a very high proportion of economic initiative must at the start be taken by the top levels of central government.

Those are the levels at which pioneering in democratic procedures will be done, if the new governments are successful. It is theirs to undertake projects that their citizens cannot start on their own. Theirs must be the planning, the deciding what to do first, the channeling of resources and effort to these ends.

But theirs must also be the induction in citizens of a willingness to assume a constantly increasing responsibility. This is the function which differentiates the new democratic governments from those which operate on totalitarian principles. Superficially, both types of government will be doing many of the same things. Both will be taking economic initiative, and the totalitarian governments will be assuring the new countries that the economic yields that they want, accepted from totalitarian sources, will be free from the problems of political power. They will be trying to make it plausible that a nation can avoid such problems, and still remain free, and that a nation can likewise deny political experience to its citizens, while bringing them into the modern world.

Effectiveness and democratic initiative

Actually, to bring their peoples fully into the modern world, the new governments must find a balance between effectiveness in doing a limited economic job, and insistence that citizens exercise their own initiative. This balance can be illustrated from a small fragment of recent experience in the Western world.

To leaders of newly developing nations, one of the most interesting of recent economic-political inventions of the United States has been the Tennessee Valley Authority. In part this is perhaps because the TVA is a new type of government machinery — only a generation old. In 1933 the Tennessee River and its tributaries ran through an agricultural region where most people, in comparison with the rest of the country, were very poor. Floods were frequent, river navigation negligible. Eight separate states, jealous of their prerogatives, controlled slices of the river's surrounding territory. The Authority which was established to develop its multiple resources covered a thousand miles of geography and a thousand subtleties of human attitude.

TVA's economic story, the yield which it has made possible, is well known. Among those who have come to see it are such ranking representatives of powers newly developing other great rivers as Premier U Nu of Burma, Ambassador Mehta of India, Defence Minister Muhammed Qudrat-I-Khuda of Pakistan, Ambassador Feridun C. Erkin of Turkey and Ambassador Ebba Eban of Israel.

Some of the countless visitors from overseas have been interested in the development of hydraulic power, some in flood control and navigation, some in soil conservation, reforestation, agricultural improvement. But most have also been interested in TVA as an instrument of government. And in this function, the TVA has its accomplishments also.

The economic yields that have followed the establishment of TVA, yields which could not have been combined under private auspices, have induced great affection for the agency among the people of the valley. With that affection has gone a willingness for the agency to conduct a wide variety of activities, to exercise functions almost without limit. But it is no less a function of the TVA to draw a line between responsibilities that it was set up to shoulder, and responsibilities that the people of the valley ought to handle on their own. Here is a case in point.

In many areas, TVA is turning acreage that was under its jurisdiction during the dam-building period back to the various states to use as they see fit. Many of these areas were planted

with trees in the early days, to halt erosion on denuded mountains and to hold the soil that was silting up the river and leaving desolation behind. These trees are now mature. In one such area, land was recently turned back to the State of Alabama and scheduled to become a state park. But a lumber company secured rights to go in and cut the timber. When the forest began to fall, alarmed citizens appealed to the TVA to step in and halt repetition of a process of cut-out-and-get-out that had previously left scars on much of the American landscape. The TVA refused. The citizens of Alabama, it noted, had the political means at hand to determine what rules should be made, and enforced, in the parks of the people of the state. It was up to them to use those means, or not to use them. They used them. While they were getting organized, the buzz-saws of the lumber operators continued to take down timber. Stump-pocked hillsides began to show up as they had a generation before, open to the gullying wash of the coming rainy season. But nevertheless the Alabama citizens did get organized. They used their democratic technics for state action. They saved the remaining timber. Because of the agitation in the case of this particular park, higher standards have been established for all parks throughout the state.

In taking this course, TVA took a risk. It staked certain loss of some resources against possible gains of some democratic initiative on the part of the people whose economy, and whose society, was involved. It took the chance that citizens would not default, that they would do, themselves, what needed to be done.

The choice was between displaying the all-embracing paternalism of a government that knows what is best for the people living under it, and conducting a limited-purpose operation which implied that citizens have their functions too.

The choice

This is a small and in some ways insignificant instance of a governmental decision. Yet the men who are heading the governments of the new nations are likely to have to weigh, over and over, the considerations that it exemplifies. To the

extent that the resources of their countries are slimmer than the resources of the Tennessee Valley, these men are likely to be subject to additional pressures to build up their economies at the expense of popular initiative. And the ever-present competition of the economic yield of countries that permit no popular initiative will exert powerful leverage on them also.

Yet the choice runs to the heart of democratic theory. It concerns the basic assumption of people and government as to the nature of man and the purpose of human society. On it depends the possibility of working towards more justice and more lasting peace, towards a world in which human beings enjoy greater fruits of more skilled and specialized labour without being treated as so much manpower to be applied to increasing horsepower in whatever manner the dictates of their government prescribe.

The risk is great of allowing citizens freedom to act — to act wisely or to act destructively, or not to act in time, or not to act at all. It is a secular form of the spiritual risk of choice between good and evil — a choice in which evil often has an important accessory in ignorance. The political democrat's confidence in the citizen's contribution of his essential mite must always be an act of faith, of often sorely tried, and frequently disappointed, faith. He can never be sure. He will sometimes look foolhardy. Those who do not believe that the individual matters will parade their successes in front of his followers.

The politics of Easter

On the first Easter after the nazi occupation of France in the second world war, a French Protestant pastor preached a sermon that linked the faith of the political democrat with the faith of the Christian in a way that is very pertinent to the current pursuit of more justice and more peace. He discussed what he called the politics of Easter. Here is part of what he said :

This leaves me all the more free to remind you that this power of Easter is, however, only the power of a hope for us at present, not a possession. Although the message of Easter rings in our ears and saves us from death, we will

none the less continue to live in the world of the Cross. Although resurrected, Jesus will none the less continue in agony to the end of the world. The world of human nature will remain, after Easter as before, a world and a nature that put the Son of God on the Cross. This is too obvious to require emphasis. The Cross will remain the distinguishing mark of this world. The substance of all that passes, the substance of human history, is not Easter but Good Friday. Jesus does not cease to suffer and die, in our midst, at our hand...

In dying, Jesus took care utterly to disappoint the demands of our covetousness. Because the message of Easter is heard only from the other side of the Cross, from beyond the end of the world, beyond the condemnation to death of all the hopes of the world, the sovereignty of the grace of God is beyond the reach of our sin, beyond the grasp of our covetous hands.

In a word, the message of Easter is the hope of the Kingdom of God. Purely a hope, not a possession. We do not get past the Cross, by means of Easter, to enter into some better world...

Therefore, take care not to rejoice too fast, too easily, in the message of Easter; for the present, the hope which it offers it nothing other than a great struggle and a great sorrow. Yet rejoice with all your heart, for this struggle and sorrow into which Easter casts you are none other than the sure and certain hope of the final triumph of Christ.

In this setting, those who believe that justice and peace can be achieved in greater measure in the human societies of this world are prepared for the task before them. Justice and peace cannot be attained by a millennial stroke. They can be won instance by instance, decision by decision. They require inventiveness, wisdom, skill and timing on the part of political leaders. On the part of both leaders and citizenry, they require a certainty that the individual matters. On the part of the citizens, they require a continuing willingness to contribute an essential mite.

Why I Became a Pacifist

MARTIN NIEMÖLLER

When I was young — half a century ago — to be called a “pacifist” was an insult. The German empire had been built on the battlefields of Bohemia and France, and ours was the second generation, a generation proud of an heroic past and eager to live up to a venerable tradition. Prussia had taken the lead in the unification of the German nation, after Austria had lost her vitality and strength, and had gained her position by self-restraint and sacrifice, and certainly not by wealth and diplomacy. Our education was idealistic and along these lines. To be poor was no disgrace, to be wealthy was no credit ; but it was disreputable to make money, and it was honourable to serve the country in the military forces for nothing. A soldier was paid a penny a day, and when I was a lieutenant in the navy I enjoyed a salary of six pounds a month. But — I was serving the country, and I would have renounced any payment, if only circumstances would have permitted. Certainly in those years we despised the moneymakers, the materialists of all kinds, knowing that we — and we alone — represented the genuine nobility of the nation, serving Germany without reward and without hope of reward. Besides, we did not think of war in those days : the armed forces were meant officially to protect safety and peace, and if necessary to risk their lives in this task. But we were no “pacifists” ; we did not reject the idea of war as a last chance to defend the country. And when in 1914 the first world war began, we hailed it as the test case of our dedication and devotion.

Relying on God's mercy

The war lasted longer than we had anticipated ; we became disillusioned, and many of us came to see that killing is a dirty job in spite of honours and medals. Personally, I went through

this war more or less like an onlooker, not realizing that it was I who did the killing when torpedoing an enemy vessel. I did not like it ; yet I did not feel any personal responsibility for it. War really was master ; war was setting the rules and by-laws for our behaviour, and — last but not least — this was the way to serve the country and the nation. I had not ceased to be a Christian ; but the only thing I learned in these years was that, because I was a Christian, I had to rely on God's mercy and forgiveness, since it was impossible not to sin in doing my duty, and that I had to live through this sort of temptation, living two different lives and yet trying to continue to be myself. The miracle came true, and I went through this first war without losing myself, without becoming cynical, without losing the sense of responsibility and the chance of changing and growing in the inner man, in my beliefs and convictions.

Christ and Hitler

The ideal survived ; I wanted to serve my country and my people. And nothing of this ideal was changed when I became a pastor. I tried hard to be a good pastor of my flock, proclaiming the Kingdom and Lordship of Christ, preaching the message of great joy. Here at last I knew that real safety and true peace are to be found in the midst of trouble and suffering, and this faith stood the test when Hitler rose to power and tried to do the impossible. When he began his fight against Christ, Christ proved His strength and superiority, giving strength to the weak and power to the meek. In those years of the early 'thirties no one thought of another war ; Hitler was looked upon as the prince of peace himself, fighting want and unemployment, leading his nation back to a sound and happy social life. If only he had not fought against the Church and the Church's message, we Christians would have hailed him like all the rest of our people. We would have even followed without any hesitation when at last he went to war again. Being Christ's enemy, Hitler knew more of Him than we did in those days. The real crisis arose when we came to see that war was not outside the plans of the ruler, but very much within them. Actually, as Hitler had to become God's instru-

ment in making us better Christians, he also became God's instrument in opening our understanding to the real meaning of the Gospel.

War again

In 1938 we had to clarify our thinking as to the problem of an aggressive war: are we allowed as Christians to justify it, at least if we are convinced that war is the most promising way to overcome national difficulties and to achieve ends which cannot be attained otherwise? When in 1938 this problem became urgent, because of Hitler's designs on Bohemia, I had already been a prisoner in a concentration camp for more than a year. But I felt that the Confessing Church was right in arranging services of intercession, in which Christians were called upon to pray for peace and that the scourge of war might pass by without bringing greater suffering to a troubled world of nations and peoples. A *Gebetsliturgie*, an order of worship, was published and circulated throughout the whole country, and aroused wrath and fury among Hitler's followers and among the state authorities. The tension disappeared again for a time due to the Munich conference, leaving behind a feeling of uncertainty about the whole problem of war and peace. For the first time doubts had arisen as to whether resort to war could be justified at all from a Christian point of view. One year later it happened, and we suddenly found ourselves in a state of war without any further warning, and the Christians in our midst had failed to make any clear decision as to what to do. There were only a few "conscientious objectors", whereas the great majority just followed the traditional line: the country was at war, everyone had to contribute his whole effort to overcome the emergency situation and do his best in order that the victory might be gained and a tolerable outcome secured.

"There is no promise in violence"

As the years passed by, thousands came to see that it would be disastrous if Hitler should win; but even then Christian convictions were divided and ambiguous, as the Church had been disorganized to such an extent that mutual consolation had

become a purely private matter among individuals. This was the situation until in 1945 the war came to an end. Things had developed in about the same way as during the first war. Times of war are for amassing experiences, but they are not conducive to drawing conclusions. In 1945 there was a general feeling that war as a means of politics had to be abolished. Our Evangelical Church in Germany came to acknowledge that we had missed the real mark of our responsibility for the nation, and the question was put as to whether or not anything could be accomplished by the use of force. A few years later the conviction that "there is no promise in violence" became general. In those days it was a theological decision, but a few years later it again became a political issue. Germany — Western Germany — was to be rearmed, and what stand should be taken by the Christian Church? Actually it was then that I personally could no longer escape a real and genuine decision. The Lutheran attitude was brought forward anew, saying that a Christian in his personal concerns is not entitled to use force and violence, but that the situation and task of the state authority is different: that it is not only right in using force and compulsion, but that it is duty-bound to use it in order to provide justice and peace. The conclusion went further: the state authorities are entitled to use force and violence against other states, and the Christian is meant, not only to share in this duty as a citizen, but he has to obey the call and become part of the armed forces if he is called upon.

"Just wars" ?

For a century and longer there had been no problem about this duty of a citizen, but now the question arose, and we had to deal with it: is it really right for a Christian to obey this call? According to tradition and inclination, I tried to get through with the answer of Martin Luther himself, which had been the answer of St. Augustine long ago: a Christian must not share in an unjust war, but if the war is just, it is his duty to fight under the responsibility of the authorities. Looking at the problem from this angle, I gave my consent to the declaration of Toronto in 1950, in which the Central Committee of

the World Council of Churches commended the decision of the United Nations to carry out a police action in Korea. This police action degenerated into a real war. Was this a "just war"? I could not believe it, when I read of the bombing raids on cities and towns whose people certainly did not want this war or any other. The question arose of whether this struggle ought not to be decided by the use of atomic weapons. A "just war" fought with atomic weapons? What did it mean? My conviction, which had looked so strong and clear, was shaken to the depths. Is war the same thing as the use of force by a government in order to secure justice and peace? Can anything good be accomplished by destroying thousands of people, innocent people — human beings — who have nothing to do with the whole matter and who have no wish except to be left in peace to live their quiet and unobtrusive lives? And am I — a Christian — even allowed to participate in this sort of enterprise, to say nothing of acknowledging a duty to do so?

Overcome evil with good

The Korean conflict became the turning point in my understanding and attitude. I had not yet found the answer, but I could no longer escape a real and earnest decision. It took me years of thinking and theorizing. I had no definite answer — and in a way I have to confess that my answer today is not a definite one either. But one thing I came to see clearly: in the New Testament and in the Person of Christ Jesus there is no encouragement for the use of force and compulsion; on the contrary, we are warned against any violence. It is true that "there is no promise in violence". On the other hand, we are called upon again and again to overcome evil by doing good. Actually, this is the only Christian way to fight against evil, whereas to return evil for evil will lead to nothing but more evil, more enmity, more hatred.

That was nothing new to me, who had been brought up in a Christian home; yet I had not realized it in the right way before. Only then I came to see that this attitude is part of the Gospel message, that it cannot become separated from the Gospel itself. For our salvation, my salvation, depends on the

fact that God has not acted by fighting His "just war" against His enemies, including ourselves and myself, but that He has overcome evil by doing good to His adversaries, that the sacrifice of His only beloved Son really is the proof: God provides salvation, justice and peace by loving His enemies, by loving me.

Knowing this, I cannot help rejecting compulsion and oppression, the use of force and violence in order to create something which is in line with God's plans among men. Christ went the way of God, renouncing any pressure, and we are summoned to follow in His footsteps. This is the counsel which is left to us in the Sermon on the Mount and in all His appeals. So the real question at last was: do I believe in the truth as revealed in Christ? Do I believe that He is Lord, the Lord to whom all power belongs, not only in heaven and in time to come, but already here and now? Will the meek inherit the earth, or is this statement an error from which we have to abstain and shrink back? Or may I rely on it, because "heaven and earth shall pass away, but his words shall not pass away"?

I confess this attitude seems to be, and is, rather primitive, and yet I cannot understand and trust the Gospel without drawing this conclusion: that Jesus is right and that I am wrong wherever and whenever I try to find a different way. I am sure that this attitude will not solve the problems of the future of the world and of humanity in it, but of one thing I am firmly convinced: that to be a "pacifist" is to take an attitude nearer to the footsteps of Christ Jesus than to try to justify a war as being possibly a just affair in which I am allowed to share. Thus I have become a pacifist, principally renouncing the use of force and violence as something to which God wants me to resort. For Christ spoke, lived and died according to this commandment and to this promise: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the sons of God."

God Wills Both Justice and Peace

ANGUS DUN and REINHOLD NIEBUHR

This article was originally published in Christianity and Crisis, Vol. XV, No. 10, June 13, 1955, with the following introduction: "Christians were urged at Amsterdam to wrestle continuously with the difficulties raised by the conflicting opinions on war. The Continuation Committee of the Historic Peace Churches in Europe issued a joint statement entitled: 'Peace Is the Will of God', but no comparable material expressing the non-pacifist point of view has been issued. Consequently, Bishop Dun and Reinhold Niebuhr were asked by certain non-pacifists to prepare an initial draft statement for discussion purposes, and to help identify some of the issues with which Christians generally need to wrestle. Their draft is here presented."

All Christians abhor war and the evils which stem from it. Non-pacifist Christians agree with their pacifist brethren on the duty to help reduce causes of conflict, and to help promote the positive conditions of peace with justice. They share the belief that the Christian should base his action in a war situation on the dictates of conscience, informed by the command of love, and that each is responsible to God for his acts. But non-pacifist Christians reject the position of absolute pacifism because it distorts the Christian concept of love and tries to apply an individual ethic to a collective situation. At the same time they recognize the moral hazards and complexities of the non-pacifist position, which are increased by the growing powers of mass destruction.

I. PACIFISM DISTORTS THE COMMAND OF LOVE

The Christian stands under the command of love, which challenges him in his relations with persons and with society. As a citizen of the Kingdom he knows the redeeming power of

the love revealed by Christ. As a citizen of a sinful society, he is called, and judged, and renewed by the divine command.

This central principle of the Christian ethic provides both the dynamic for transforming personal relations and the mainspring for social responsibility. Love has what might be called two dimensions: the vertical dimension of perfection, of sacrificial love; and the horizontal dimension of concern for all people, of concern for social justice and the balances by which it is maintained. The pacifist comprehension of love seizes upon one of these two aspects. It makes an absolute of sacrificial love at the expense of social responsibility. The pacifist tends to regard the love command less as an over-arching principle which confronts the Christian in all his relations than as a neat formula to use in situations of violence. This is an inadequate, distorted view of the Christian concept of love.

This partial view leads the pacifist to exalt peace over the claims of justice, when a choice between the two must be made. Non-violence is regarded as a pure expression of love, while the struggle for justice is seen as a rough and inferior approximation of love. It is true that the Christian must wrestle with the ultimate possibilities of love. And justice, which depends upon the uneasy balances of social life, is not ultimate. On the other hand, justice is not essentially a compromise with evil or simply an approximation of love in an evil world. It expresses the social responsibility which stems from one dimension of love. Justice is an instrument of love in a sinful society. To abandon it, whenever violence is involved, is irresponsible.

The struggle for justice and the struggle for peace have the same sanction in the commandment of love. Both present a moral imperative. But justice has the prior claim, for while order may be conducive to justice, there can be no lasting peace without justice. The biblical concept is expressed by Isaiah: "And the effect of righteousness will be peace" (Is. 32: 17). The just war position gains strength from the consideration that the triumph of an unjust cause would defeat both the ends of justice and the future hope of peace.

By making an absolute of non-violence, the pacifist is led to a position of social irresponsibility. Violence is regarded as sinful, no matter how just the cause or how great the wicked-

ness which would follow its defeat. Non-violence is seen as an escape from sin, no matter how evil the consequences which may flow from it. Many pacifists naively believe that the consequences of non-violence can only be good. Some, however, recognize that the consequences for society in any particular situation may not be good, and find justification in the unqualified character of the command, that "under no circumstance . . . may the Christian take the life of his fellow man . . ."¹ Identifying the pacifist position with obedience to Christ, these argue that the Christian "may not calculate in advance what this may mean for himself or for society"². Yet the calculation of consequences is part of a responsible moral decision. The "works", for which every man is "responsible to God"³, include the results as well as the motive of our deeds.

II. PACIFISM APPLIES AN INDIVIDUAL ETHIC TO A COLLECTIVE SITUATION

The tendency towards social irresponsibility in the pacifist position also derives from the attempt to apply the personal ethic of sacrificial love to the social problems of war. Pacifists say that Christians must accept suffering instead of inflicting it. This is quite true, so far as personal relations are concerned. But the moral issues of war seldom present themselves in such simple terms. The issue often is whether or not to accept (and thus to inflict) suffering by others, as the victims of aggression or injustice. This issue cannot be resolved by a formula of non-violence, quite applicable to individual relations. A social ethic is required.

The same tendency is seen in reverse in the pacifist interpretation of the phrase of the Amsterdam Report, "War is contrary to the will of God". As the context ought to make clear, this phrase is a condemnation of war as an institution, as a social evil. It does not say or mean that the aggressor and the victim are alike condemned. No, the predominantly non-pacifist group which approved this phrase did not assume

¹ *Peace Is the Will of God*, p. 17.

² *Ibid.*, p. 14.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

that degrees of guilt and innocence had been wiped out by the increasingly catastrophic character of modern war. Yet pacifists move directly from the social evil of war to an individual ethic: "since 'war is contrary to the will of God' it would seem to be incumbent on every Christian to abstain from it" ¹. Here the claims of justice disappear.

In the face of such criticism, pacifists find refuge in the unconditional demand of sacrificial love: "even if a particular war were likely to preserve more lives and values than it would destroy... it could never be the duty of a follower of Christ to take the lives of some of God's children in the hope of protecting the lives and liberties of others" ². Whose duty then is it to protect the lives and liberties of others? Apparently pacifists who stop short of philosophical anarchism would say the state, whose primary task is to be the "guarantor of order", is responsible ³. Non-pacifist Christians today would largely agree as to the "delegated, relative, and provisional nature" of the authority exercised by the state, and that it applies to "unredeemed society" under the "dispensation of providence" as compared with the "dispensation of redemption" ⁴. The issue here is the relation of the Christian to the state.

The very limited concept of Christian citizenship held by pacifist Christians is one of the weaknesses of their position. The responsibility of the Christian to and for the state is recognized up to a point: "In keeping with his conscientious affirmation of the state, he seeks through every legitimate secular or political means to help build the kind of society which can avoid war." ⁵ But when the state has to exercise its admitted central function as guarantor of order, then the state is abandoned on the ground that the Christian has a higher loyalty and code of conduct. The Christian is thus "in the world" until coercion or violence enter the scene, when he becomes "not of the world".

This is a wrong concept of the tension in which the Christian stands, for the demands of the Gospel challenge him at every point, and not merely when the state resorts to force. And he

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 4. — ² *Ibid.*, p. 6. — ³ *Ibid.*, p. 15ff.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17. — ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

is obliged to act responsibly in society at all times, and not merely when the state is at peace. Being in the world, but not of the world, applies to the whole of life.

Moreover, pacifists not only refuse to support the state when it tries to preserve order. Many tend, by translating pacifist principles into political terms, to oppose or weaken the power of the state to maintain order or to defend justice. Thus, the Church is urged to "renounce war... even to the point of counseling a nation not to resist foreign conquest and occupation" and to "refusing arms even for defence of those values that the Gospel has produced in our civilization"¹. The advocacy of unilateral disarmament and national non-resistance constitutes not a pacifist witness but an effort to impose a pacifist policy on the state itself, the "guarantor of order". Such aberrations of Christian pacifism spring not from the principle of sacrificial love, but from regarding it as the framework of a political strategy. The confusion between an individual and a social ethic is here compounded.

These, in brief, are reasons why non-pacifist Christians find pacifism an inadequate expression of the commandment of love, and are compelled to reject it. But it is easier for them to point out the weaknesses of the pacifist position than to work out a satisfactory formulation of their own more complex position.

III. THE CONCEPT OF THE JUST WAR

There is no adequate definition of a just war which can surely be applied to the various conceivable war situations with which the nations may be confronted. Nor is such a definition likely to emerge. For the permutations of the international crisis, the shifting claims of justice and order, and the changing consequences of alternative courses, are endless. Consequently, for non-pacifist Christians unable to make the state the keeper of their consciences, there is no easy way or foolproof guide. In the end, each must weigh the conflicting claims for himself, in the light of the most objective information available. Each must decide whether, on balance, there is enough preponderance

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 18¹, 20.

of moral value on one side of a conflict to justify conscientious participation. While the judgments of the Christian community can help, in the final analysis the individual conscience is the arbiter of the concept of a just war.

A heavy burden of responsibility is thus placed on the individual Christian. His access to accurate and objective information, particularly in a war situation, is limited. The principles he must strive to apply, while finding sanction in the commands of the Gospel, do not provide any infallible guide to his decision. There are no foolproof yardsticks for him to use. And the possibilities of erroneous conclusions in such complex situations are many. The hazards here, which are the hazards of the Protestant heritage, are real.

To help guide the conscience and to reduce the hazards, various formulas have been advanced. Each has its merits and its weaknesses. The three positions put forward at Oxford and Amsterdam may be referred to briefly.

The traditional concept of a just war, which is the official position of Roman Catholicism as well as of certain communions within the ecumenical fellowship, defines a just war as one in which just means are used to defend a just cause. This traditional concept calls attention to the importance of means appropriate to the ends sought and to the danger of excessive violence. But efforts to construct a precise guide through detailed elaborations of this definition result in a rigid and highly artificial structure, more likely to confuse than illumine the conscience.

An example of such confusion is the first position advanced in the Amsterdam Report, a position derived from this traditional concept :

There are those who hold that, even though entering a war may be a Christian's duty in particular circumstances, modern warfare, with its mass destruction, can never be an act of justice.

This says in effect that because the excessive violence of atomic weapons does not fit the traditional formalistic definition of a just war, the term should be dropped. Yet since the problem of a just war remains, whatever the terminology, a new

term must be used such as Christian duty. Here the effort to preserve an elaborate formula has gotten in the way of clear thinking. For what is the ground of Christian duty except the concern for justice and order ?

A second approach to guidance for the Christian conscience is one which attempts to establish international law as the plumb line for the concept of a just war. This position was stated in differing ways at Oxford and at Amsterdam. The valid element here is recognition that the judgment of the international community can provide a corrective to the distortions of national interest and provide a factor of relative objectivity in determining the justice or injustice of a particular cause. Thus the presence in Korea of a United Nations Commission provided an important element of objectivity in determining the aggressor. It was on the basis of this report that the World Council's Central Committee urged support for the collective measures undertaken by the United Nations.

The Oxford definition held that Christians are obligated to take part in wars, comparable with police measures, against transgressors of international agreements and pacts. But in recognition of the fact that many causes of conflict are not covered by such agreements, it was added that Christians should participate only in such wars as are "justifiable on the basis of international law". The Amsterdam definition is somewhat more general :

In the absence of impartial supra-national institutions, there are those who hold that military action is the ultimate sanction of the rule of law, and that citizens must be distinctly taught that it is their duty to defend the law by force if necessary.

In so far as there is a "rule of law" in international affairs, that law does provide an aid to conscience. But it is clear that the rule of law in world affairs is both primitive and partial. Undue reliance on it as a guide leads to a false legalism. The United Nations provides the most objective collective judgment available, but it is not an "impartial supra-national" institution, nor is it infallible. To "defend the law" is part of the defence of justice and order, but it is no substitute for it.

The third approach to the concept of a just war, is the position advanced at Oxford that Christians, in obedience to conscience, have a duty to participate in war "waged to vindicate what they believe to be an essential Christian principle: to defend the victims of wanton aggression, or to secure freedom for the oppressed". In its stress upon conscience and its avoidance of elaborate formulas, this definition is closest to the idea of a just war here advanced. It has the merit of simplicity, and flexibility in the face of changing crisis. It also has the weakness of giving little precise guidance to the conscience. While aggression and oppression remain the chief targets of a just war, the formulation seems to breathe more of a crusading spirit than most non-pacifist Christians would find appropriate today.

IV. THE NEW DIMENSION OF WAR

The rapid development of weapons of mass destruction has enormously increased the destructive power in Soviet and Western hands. This has created a new dimension of catastrophe for any future global war. And because of the ramifications of the power blocs, and the tensions between them, there is grave danger that limited wars will become a global war. Obviously, the probability of tremendous, perhaps incalculable, destruction on both sides in a future war needs to be reckoned with in the moral calculations of the just war position.

The notion that the excessive violence of atomic warfare has ended the possibility of a just war does not stand up. Even the Amsterdam proposition, which rejected the concept of the just war, as traditionally defined, brought back the idea itself under the guise of Christian "duty in particular circumstances". The moral problem has been altered, not eliminated.

The threat of atomic destruction has heightened the criminal irresponsibility of aggression, the employment of war as an instrument of national or bloc policy. Correspondingly, the moral obligation to discourage such a crime or, if it occurs, to deny it victory, has been underscored. The consequences of a successful defence are fearful to contemplate, but the consequences of a successful aggression, with tyrannical monopoly

of the weapons of mass destruction, are calculated to be worse. While the avoidance of excessive and indiscriminate violence, and of such destruction as would undermine the basis for future peace remain moral imperatives in a just war, it does not seem possible to draw a line in advance, beyond which it would be better to yield than to resist.

Resistance to aggression, designed to deny it victory and tyrannical control, is not to be equated with victory by those who resist the aggressor. In view of war's new dimension of annihilation, the justification for a defensive war of limited objectives, to prevent conquest and to force an end to hostilities, does not apply equally to the objectives of bringing an aggressor to unconditional surrender and punishment. Because the ultimate consequences of atomic warfare cannot be measured, only the most imperative demands of justice have a clear sanction.

For this reason, the occasions to which the concept of the just war can be rightly applied have become highly restricted. A war to "defend the victims of wanton aggression", where the demands of justice join the demands of order, is today the clearest case of a just war. But where the immediate claims of order and justice conflict, as in a war initiated "to secure freedom for the oppressed", the case is now much less clear. The claims of justice are no less. But because contemporary war places so many moral values in incalculable jeopardy, the immediate claims of order have become much greater. Although oppression was never more abhorrent to the Christian conscience or more dangerous to the longer-range prospects of peace than today, the concept of a just war does not provide moral justification for initiating a war of incalculable consequences to end such oppression.

While this position gives the claims of order a certain priority over the claims of justice, the fact remains that no lasting peace is possible except on foundations of justice. Nor can the short-range prospects be improved unless remedial measures are taken in regard to social injustices likely to erupt as civil and hence international war. Consequently, the restraints imposed by the new dimension of war underline the importance of a vigorous development of methods of peaceful change. For God wills both justice and peace.

The Relevance of Christian Faith within Human Conflict

C. L. PATIJN

The editor of *The Student World*, knowing my profession, has forbidden me to write on the problem of peace in the manner which would suit my knowledge and preference. I am asked not to deal with any specific international problem of today, nor with the theoretical problem of peace in general. The question is different and a more personal one: what does it mean to be a Christian involved in conflicts between men? I take it that in a symposium on peace the words "human conflict" stand for those grave controversies between human collectivities, groups and nations, which in the language of the Charter of the United Nations are called, in a sinister crescendo, "disputes", "situations likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security", "threats to the peace", "aggression" and "war". They are human conflicts as far as human interest, aspirations, convictions and emotions are involved, and they clearly represent a clash of rival human vitalities. At the same time they are superhuman, as the conflicts of collectivities in which the individual gets lost and personal influence does not carry much weight. What does it mean, on the basis of personal experience (I quote the editor again), to be a Christian involved in such political conflicts? Or to make it even more concrete and frightening: what is the relevance of the Christian faith in the cold war, the colonial question, the tragic situations in Algeria and Cyprus, the fateful strife between the Arab states and Israel, the racial problems of Africa? What does it mean to be a Christian in such a world in the atomic age?

In the same boat

One thing must be clear from the outset : these conflicts are exactly the same for Christians and non-Christians. The menace is alike for all people involved ; reality is not different for a Christian, a Hindu or an atheist. Their conceptions of history may differ, their hopes and fears and ethical standards may differ, but the problem of remedial action in a conflict of this kind presents itself to all of them in the same way. The facts, the challenge and the responsibility are the same for Christians and non-Christians ; we are all of us as men in history in the same boat.

Not only with respect to the facts, but also as responsible beings. For one who has some experience of politics, there can be no doubt that the sense of responsibility is equally well developed in Christians and non-Christians. While a Christian feels responsible before God for his due share of political and social action to secure for all men justice, freedom and peace, others may be induced to responsible action out of respect for an unknown God, as the Athenians to whom St. Paul appealed ; or a majestic law, a categorical imperative, like Kant ; or simply because of human probity, the *honnêteté qui consiste à faire son métier*¹. If there is any special relevance of the Christian faith within human conflict, it does not imply that the Christian is in any way exempted from the impact of the facts, nor that he has a sense of responsibility which distinguishes him from others. He is a man in the midst of men, of like passions, under the same sky, in a world distorted by sin and the results of sin, in which he has to live under the same conditions as everyone else.

Individual ethics in collective situations

Does the Christian faith give him a special insight and wisdom, which make him a better instrument of conciliation in human conflict than the non-Christian ? It is widely believed in the Church that the faithful Christian is the best citizen, since the unsearchable riches of Christ in which we participate

¹ Albert Camus, *La Peste*.

are instrumental also to the political health of the world. In the field of international politics today, however, it is difficult to find much evidence of this. I have listened often and carefully to pronouncements claiming a Christian insight or offering a Christian approach in a situation of political conflict. Most times I have been disappointed.

I may give here a few examples, not in any way to disparage Christian initiatives which in their own right and special field of action are of great value, but in order to clarify the issue. It is not difficult for one who is involved in politics to come in touch with the movements of Moral Rearmament or Christian Leadership, or similar movements. These very active groups, showing a great missionary zeal, sometimes pretend to know the way out of political strife and conflict: change the man and you will change the world! But the troubles of this world are only to a limited extent the results of human sins, and accordingly only to a limited extent capable of improvement through personal spiritual renovation. The mistakes of these and other movements is their application of individual ethics to collective situations. In international politics we are in the realm of states and empires whose function is to preserve peace and order, to act with institutional means and to think in categories of social and international justice. An individualistic approach sometimes can improve the atmosphere, but does not strike home in the substance of politics itself in which we are called to responsible action. It therefore contributes little to the solution of the problems. Frequently also we find attempts to define the position of the Christian in politics in the language of general principles of moral law. In some countries, especially in America, Christian discussion sometimes is drowned by resounding moralisms which contribute little to the understanding of the Gospel or to the solution of specific conflicts. Such moralism and every other attempt to formulate the Christian ethic in an abstract and rational way tend to shade the light of the Gospel and prevent a Christian from seeking his own solution for his peculiar problem, *hic et nunc*, in concrete obedience to the providential and saving will of God. Legalism can only destroy the relevance of the Christian faith within human conflict.

Church pronouncements

Most important for our subject is, of course, what has been stated with regard to specific conflicts by churches in an official capacity or through unofficial action by groups of ecclesiastical leaders. I must admit that, with a few exceptions, most pronouncements of this kind with regard to grave international problems of the last few years have been for me a great disappointment. It is obvious to every unbiased outsider that, as soon as a church agency tries to pass from the ethical general to the specific in international affairs, it is inclined to speak with the voice of its political surroundings. When the Church comes down on earth out of the clouds of general principles and tries to formulate the relevance of the Christian faith in concrete situations, its judgment, which was unison in the theological abstraction, tends to break up in all the colours of the political spectrum. It is agonizing to see theologians of the churches in Eastern Europe speaking on the problems of the cold war in the terms and conceptions of communist propaganda, that in countries with a strong neutralist sentiment the voice of the Church tends to be neutralist, that in parts of the Western world still so many voices in the Church speak in terms of the defence of a way of life against communism. And all of them claim to interpret the Christian faith with regard to the same political problem.

For the same reason, even official pronouncements of the World Council of Churches and its agencies are not always satisfactory. Some parts of the Evanston report on international affairs are lacking in concreteness and are open to the criticism that they tend to treat problems from a perch above the clouds. This does not apply to the action of such agencies as the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs in the practical field, nor to some reports in the last few years especially of the American churches. There are some exceptions to the rule, but I feel strongly that, generally speaking, in theology and corporate action the churches have not yet found the relation of the New Testament ethic to the world of concrete international responsibility. There is a very revealing sentence in Bonhoeffer's letters with regard to this problem. In

discussing the theology of Karl Barth, he praises him highly for his dogmatics, but makes the following remark regarding his ethics: "It was not that he subsequently, as is often claimed, failed in ethics, for his ethical observations... are just as significant as his dogmatic ones; it was that he gave no concrete guidance either in dogmatics or in ethics, on the *non-religious interpretation of theological concepts*." Therefore, some great concepts of Christian theology in the Church of our day "remain unexplained and remote, because *there is no interpretation of them*". I feel that for this reason the relevance of Christian faith within human conflict is uncertain in the Church today.

We must live the life of this world

Here I could stop, since I do not pretend to know better than my church. I will, however, try to go one step further and to explore the character of the relevance of our faith in its relation to the world. We are called to live in a world in which God is present, but in the shape of Jesus Christ, powerless and in agony. "*Jésus sera en agonie jusqu'à la fin du monde; il ne faut pas dormir pendant ce temps-là*"¹. We are called to share God's purpose and to take history as seriously as He did, as the humble partners of His powerlessness in the world. This implies that God will never appear as a *deus ex machina*. We must live the life of this world and share its sorrow, pain and conflict, *etsi deus non daretur*. The world itself is the place of our concrete responsibility. A Christian does not offer technical answers or specific solutions which statesmen and experts have not found (Evanston report on social questions). There are no Christian politics which are substantially different from other responsible forms of politics. We must discuss and decide in terms of historical alternatives, Christians and non-Christians alike, and cannot withdraw from reality. For God makes us responsible in the concrete historical events and "obedience to His will requires us to enter fully into the duties of the common life, understand to the best of our ability the economic, political

¹ Pascal, *Pensées*, Edition Brunschvicg, Section VII, *Le Mystère de Jésus*.

and social problems of our time, participate actively in the effort to solve them" ¹. The relevance of the Christian faith in political life will not appear directly as a succession of special "Christian" decisions, but indirectly as a service and contribution to the political health of the community ².

Our faith, therefore, compels us to judge the conflicts of this world in their own categories. We are not called to establish a Christian world: we are called to work for justice and peace, freedom and truth, in social and political life. Not in the abstract, but from day to day in the place of our earthly responsibilities. In international life this means a constant struggle for an "international order under political instruments, powerful enough to regulate the relations of nations and to compose their competing desires" ³. In the absence of such an organization it means a constant struggle for the maintenance of justice and peace under the system of a balance of power. It will imply also a continuous fight for social justice in a world of unequal resources and great differences of income between groups and peoples. It will be a long-term effort in which we must avoid political and technical mistakes, for we will be judged by the success and outcome of our work.

Present but a secret

What, then, is the relevance of the Christian faith within human conflict? To someone living in Europe it seems rather astonishing that this can be a question at all. Our Western world is to a large extent a product of the Christian faith which has demonstrated its relevance in mighty works of art and thinking, and in the blessing of spiritual freedom and wise political institutions. But for international politics today I cannot give the reply.

In the present conflicts of Europe, the cold war, the future of Germany, the colonial tangle, it seems more than ever before

¹ Report of the Advisory Commission on the Main Theme of the Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches.

² Karl Barth, *Christengemeinde und Bürgergemeinde*.

³ Reinhold Niebuhr, *Discerning the Signs of the Times*, sermon III, "The Age between the Ages".

impossible to reach agreement among Christians regarding the implications of the Christian ethic in politics. In other parts of the world it may be easier now, as it has been easier in former days in the Western world. For us the light of revelation in situations of political conflict has contracted. We are close to those biblical situations, where the relevance of faith is present, but as a secret.

I am inclined to think especially of two radically different patterns of Christian life: the saint and the statesman. The saint, in a monastery, or in another way anonymous as a little man in a big society, lives outside official history and does not make any attempt to influence human conflict. And the hard-working, selfless statesman, who is eaten up by history, lives in a desert of equally unsatisfactory historical alternatives and has no time for anything else than the taming of human conflict day by day with the limited spiritual and material resources at his disposal. We cannot write their record as an epic of Christian statesmanship; we cannot even see much connection between their faith and their action in society. But in the Bible they turn up as the salt of the earth. If there had been ten righteous within the city, Sodom would not have been destroyed. And the righteous who did not know that they saw the Lord hungry and thirsty, a stranger, or naked, or in prison, inherit the Kingdom because they have done it unto the least of the brethren.

What is the relevance of their faith? It is hard to say, but thereby hangs a tale.

A Conversation on War and Peace

AN INTERVIEW WITH DR. LEIMENA

Former Minister of Health in the Indonesian Government

Question : Peace is one of the questions which we find discussed most often at the present time in political papers. It is one of the words which has always appeared frequently in Christian thinking. Do you, as an Asian Christian political leader, find a direct relationship between these two questions ?

Answer : Peace in the theological sense of the word is the right relationship between man and his God. On the other hand, if we think in political terms, it means the existence of such a relationship between man and man, group and group, nation and nation, that if a conflict arises they try to solve it in a peaceful way.

Question : What do you mean by "peaceful way" ?

Answer : By peaceful way I mean, in the case of international relationships, the effort to avoid a shooting war, and to substitute for it another way of solution.

Question : Could you come to the problem of relationships between peace and the Christian faith ?

Answer : If all men in this world had the right relationship with their God, we would have achieved peace in the theological sense of the word, and within this world even in its political sense.

Question : Do you mean, therefore, that unless all men come to this right relationship to their God there will be no real peace ?

Answer : Yes, I mean that.

Question : Don't you think this is a very pessimistic statement ?

Answer : It sounds pessimistic, but the Bible always gives us two aspects of truth, one which looks pessimistic, the other which looks optimistic. As a Christian I have been involved for many years in active political life, and it has often been very difficult for me to find the right synthesis between these two. I believe that the doctrine of the fall means that the whole of mankind has fallen into sin and will remain in sin until the end of the world. But, on the other hand, Christ has redeemed this world. This means that He has redeemed the whole of mankind and particularly those who believe in Him. This is the basis of my thinking, and it raises two questions.

The first, and this is a question I always ask of myself, is whether we believe that by their own efforts Christians may achieve the total prevention of warfare.

The second is, what is my duty as a Christian in the world full of conflicts in order to prevent the outbreak of war ?

To the first question I answer, personally, that I believe that this world will never until its end be free, not only of conflicts, but even of open warfare.

To the second question I answer : my obvious duty as a Christian is to do everything possible to prevent the outbreak of open warfare. That is why I am in such full agreement with all the efforts of the United Nations in this area. This is also the reason why I spontaneously took part in the conversations with Holland during the struggle of Indonesia for its independence in 1945 and the following years. During these negotiations I learned a bitter lesson about the dark powers of this world, which taught me a sort of realism. I was really shocked. I went through a spiritual crisis, but I came ultimately to the conviction that, when we find these dark powers at work, this is precisely the time when we have to fight them. And this often means open warfare. It thus becomes in some cases a Christian duty to resort to shooting war. I say this on the basis of my experiences in the Dutch-Indonesian conflict, but it probably could be extended to some other conflicts in this world. But it is true, it always was true, and will always remain true, that man can reach this ultimate conclusion only by taking upon himself the full responsibility for his course of

action within the specific situation in which he has been placed by God.

Question : Until now you have been speaking on the basis of your Christian faith as well as of your political experience. Would you say that because of your Christian faith you have been led to political standpoints different from those which non-Christians would have reached as a result of similar political experiences? In other words, how far is your practical political attitude a result only of your political situation, and how far of both your political situation *and* your Christian faith?

Answer : Every man is, of course, conditioned by his environment and his fundamental convictions, and it is obvious, for instance, that a Buddhist would be much more inclined to absolute pacifism than the followers of some other religions. In the example I have given of my participation in the struggle for Indonesian independence, the point at which the uniqueness of Christian faith appeared was not that I reached a different practical decision from that of non-Christian Indonesians, but that before reaching this practical decision to fight I had to go through a painful spiritual struggle.

Question : Do you mean that you cannot conceive that our Christian faith might lead us to different practical decisions than those taken by non-Christians?

Answer : Yes. For instance, as a Christian I personally think that another world war is ultimately inevitable. Nevertheless, as a Christian I have to take my stand against such a possibility. That is to say, even though I think this war will come, I exert all my energy and use all my power to fight to prevent it. On the contrary, it seems to me that many non-Christians, if convinced of the inevitability of the new world war, might be led simply to the passive or even cynical acceptance of it.

While we are speaking about the possibility of world war, let me say in very simple terms something which is of real importance in the question of politics. There are very often conflicts involving two or more countries in a particular area of the world, and these conflicts threaten to evolve easily into a potential or effective world war. In such a case it seems to me the duty of other nations, especially the big powers, and

of such international bodies as the United Nations, to act as if they were a senior person looking at two schoolboys fighting for a piece of bread. The senior person can do two things: either get hold of the piece of bread and say to the boys: "I shall decide how it must be used; possibly one half to each, or the whole to one, or nothing for either." But it often happens that the two schoolboys refuse such a solution, in which case the senior person simply has to tell them: "O.K., you fight it out, but you fight it out under my control, and my control means practically that you will not call for the help of your brothers or cousins or friends. Your battle will remain just a battle between the two of you." That is to say, if big powers or international organizations are unable to prevent warfare from breaking out in one corner of the world, it is essential that they do everything possible to isolate this conflict and prevent it from spreading, from involving other nations and other geographic areas.

Question : On the basis of what you have said, have you in your political life experienced any difficulties either in co-operating or discussing with non-Christian political leaders ?

Answer : It is quite obvious that when we meet together as Christians in political life, across the conference table and even in open conflict, our relationships are different from those between non-Christians. We are all inevitably concerned with the defence of what we consider the rights or interests of our country, but we also know that at the same time we are compelled by our Christian faith to find a solution which will avoid the use of violence and contribute to the establishment of good relations between opposing groups or countries. Because as Christians we all share the same concern, there is always between us, whatever party or country we belong to, a sort of profound understanding of sharing the same faith.

Question : Does this lead you in national matters to the conviction that Christian political parties are indispensable ?

Answer : The creation of a Christian political party is never a question of life or death. To my mind it is mostly a matter of expediency. It may happen that at a given moment in history the Christian community in a given country is chal-

lenged by a specific situation to the creation of a Christian party. This does not mean that such a party should last forever. When the political situation which has provoked its rise has changed, this Christian party may dissolve. For instance, at the present moment of Indonesian history, as shown by the results of the last national elections, most Christians (and perhaps even some non-Christians) voted for the Indonesian Christian Party (Parkindo). This means that at this given moment in our specific situation they thought, whatever church they belonged to, that it was useful to support a Christian political party, and this not only for the good of their own individual life, but also for the good of the church.

Question : Is there any problem for Parkindo to cooperate with Moslem parties, with the communist party, or with parties of other political or ideological bases ?

Answer : As a Christian party we have, of course, to be concerned with the interests of the Christian community in Indonesia. But we share with all other groups the same concern for the interest of the large community of the nation, and in any case we have always to beware lest our concern for our own interests as a Christian community might become detrimental to the welfare of the whole nation.

A Christian View of World Peace

An African Viewpoint

M. F. DEI-ANANG

Ideological illusions

The tragedy of our present century is that we are increasingly plagued with abstract notions about fundamental issues. The ideological illusions of our time give us no opportunity to maintain a clear and unadulterated view of our problems.

It is fashionable in these days to talk of disease, poverty, sin and ignorance, not to mention the familiar "isms", instead of remembering the plight of sick babies, the loneliness of destitute orphans or the helplessness of misguided citizens. So we talk of peace and war almost as abstract concepts, and forget the horrible destitution which war brings to the victor and vanquished alike, or fail to count our blessings over the prosperity and expansiveness which peace sheds in our hearts.

This process has unfortunately been accelerated by two vital forces: (1) the rapid transition in the west from the predominance of the middle classes to that of the masses in national policies; (2) the swing from the nineteenth century concept of political rights to the modern ideal of "social justice".

The *laissez-faire* policies of the nineteenth century may have had evil consequences, as, for example, the slave trade in Africa, but their value in focusing attention on individual personalities and on specific problems cannot be disputed. The attitude of mind which was prevalent in that century produced men like William Wilberforce, who attacked the rich merchant princes of his day, most of whom accumulated their wealth from the blood and toil of slaves. It was the same spirit which urged John

Wesley to prick the conscience of his countrymen with his soul-stirring sermons. That spirit is, alas, lost to a new age in which we have become the unwilling victims of mass hysteria, an age in which the gregarious instinct of man has found expression in mass-produced opinions remarkable for their vulgarity and absolute lack of distinctiveness or of appeal to the best in all of us. Our desires, wishes, aspirations, objectives are all mass produced today in a cheap, shoddy manner, and mankind is at the mercy of demagogues who are past masters in the art of exploiting their understanding of mob psychology. Can one wonder that, in such circumstances, war has become a household word the world over.

Our brother's keeper

So too we have moved from normal interest in the rights of the individual, the sanctity of personal freedom, to a vague state of mind in which appeals are constantly made to "social justice" in the abstract, ignoring the aspirations and feelings of ordinary men and women. In the desire of national groups to promote the vague dictates of nationalism, a situation is often developed which makes the biblical injunction of responsibility for our brother very difficult to observe. So peace finds no chance of survival in our modern world.

It is imperative that we should act now as though each one of us was his brother's keeper — "brother" being used in its widest possible sense, indeed, in its true African context covering the entire human family. In Africa a brother is one who belongs to the extended family group, including cousins many degrees removed from the immediate family. I believe this is the idea which Professor Carr appears to be groping after in a very pregnant statement in his *Nationalism and After* :

No international organisation of power, whether it be called a World Security Organisation or an International Police Force or by any other name, will prove durable unless it is felt to rest on certain common principles — worthy to command the assent and loyalty of men and women throughout the world.

Christian virtues and standards

As a Christian, I can agree only up to a point with Professor Carr, for the fundamental value of his statement lies in what he considers to be the basis of his "certain common principles". If his common principles are prompted by faithful respect for the basic Christian qualities — loving one's brother as oneself, turning the other cheek, honouring one's mother and father — then indeed Professor Carr provides an effective answer for building a new world order in which peace will stand supreme. For it is the extent to which the men and women of our time are prepared to practise faithfully the Christian virtues in their day-to-day activities that will indicate what chances we have of survival. It is our only opportunity to remove the horrible dread of war from our hearts. We must admit that only the permanent and true Christian virtues can save the world. Acceptance of the Christian pattern of living is a sounder basis for creating a new world order than outmoded ideas of empire solidarity and security. I am reminded of a remarkable passage in the preface to Bernard Shaw's *On the Rocks*, in which Jesus is addressing Pilate :

I say to you, cast out fear. Speak no more vain things to me about the greatness of Rome. The greatness of Rome as you call it is nothing but fear ; fear of the past and fear of the future, fear of the poor, fear of the rich, fear of the high princes, fear of the Jews and Greeks, who are learned, fear of the Gauls and the Goths and Huns, who are barbarians, fear of the Carthage you destroyed to save you from fear of it, and now fear worse than ever, fear of Imperial Caesar, the idol you have yourselves created, and fear of me, the penniless vagrant, buffeted and mocked, fear of everything except the rule of God, faith in nothing but blood and iron and gold. You, standing for Rome, are the universal coward ; I, standing for the Kingdom of God, have braved everything, lost everything, and won an eternal crown.

In our urgent quest for peace, Christians must give the lead and set the pace. They must be prepared to stand for unpopular causes ; world opinion is just the sum total of the views of ordinary men and women on various matters of national

interest. The politicians will have no chance in a world which is now ruled by the wishes and desires and passions of the "masses", if the separate individuals who constitute that formidable bloc are morally bankrupt.

This, it must be admitted, is a gloomy thesis, since it leaves the fate of the world in the hands of the countless millions who are non-Christians : the good will of Christians and their efforts for peace will surely be thwarted by others who accept standards not always comparable to those observed by Christians. We must not lose hope, however, for man's experience is witness to the potent power of the forces of good over those of evil. Increasing numbers of people who are not themselves Christians are beginning to realize that Christian standards — the basic Christian principles untrammelled by the confusing accretions of doctrinal theories — are the safest and surest measure of correct conduct.

Bandung conference

We in Africa cannot help watching with a certain degree of disappointment the poor efforts of the civilized nations of the West to maintain world peace. We are dismayed to note that those who found it so easy in the past to sit in judgment on us and to brand us as savages because of our inter-tribal wars do not appear to see much virtue in composing their own differences peacefully. It is superfluous to assert that Africa is vitally interested in the maintenance of peace : a considerable portion of this ancient continent is just beginning to emerge into full nationhood. It is important for these young nations that there be peace and harmony in the world. International upheavals upset the quiet, steady atmosphere in which alone they can truly enjoy the fruits of their new-found freedom. Asia, I find, shares this desire for permanent peace and took the opportunity of the recent Bandung conference to express this wish to the whole world. I was a delegate to the epoch-making conference in Indonesia and was impressed by the infectious sincerity and conviction with which the Asian and African members of the conference spoke for peace. Among the many resolutions passed at the end of the delegates' deliber-

ations, I regard this one as the most significant: "Nations should practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours." Here the teachings of Christ are becoming manifest in the lives of countless millions of Asians and Africans — more than two-thirds of the human race — who are not themselves predominantly Christian. The challenge to Christians is great, but great too is their opportunity in our time. I believe that the peoples of Africa and Asia — eager, determined and sincere in their urgent endeavour to build for themselves a new world — have a rich contribution to make to world peace.

Christian Realism and Idealistic Illusions

KYAW THAN

One view of man and history holds that individual human beings determine the course of history, and that therefore to mould men is to mould history itself. This is an oversimplification of the convictions of those who attempt to promote peace in the world through influencing individuals. Another view of man and history holds that all history is politics and all politics is economics, and that therefore to change social and economic systems is to change men and history. Again this is an oversimplification, this time of the conviction of those who try to promote peace in history by working for the reform or overthrow of social and economic systems which breed injustice and discontent. Still another view holds that history is an illusion and meaningless, and it is vain to strive to influence its course and to look for true peace within it.

Peace is indivisible

These three examples of human attitudes towards peace sound as if it were possible for it to be compartmentalized; they seem to imply that peace is possible in one area of human existence apart from all others. Some talk of peace in international politics, with special reference to the avoidance of war — the prevention of armed conflict among nations. Others speak of peace of mind and the “integration” of personality. Still others emphasize peace in human relations — among races, economic groups and social classes — and use such terms as industrial and economic peace, communal and social peace. But for the Christian, peace is indivisible. Peace within oneself, in human relations, in industry, in the community of nations — all are bound up together. To talk of peace either

in a purely personal and moral sense or in an exclusively collective or international context is to misrepresent and do violence to the true nature and "wholeness" of peace.

Man desires peace, but he is not only an individual with worth and significance in himself, but also a social and political being. His desire for peace cannot be dealt with piecemeal, and must be considered in relation to these two sides of his nature. The attempts of the psychologist, the politician, the well-intentioned bridge-builder among men will contribute to peace only in so far as they recognize the true and whole nature of man and the indivisibility of the peace he longs to enjoy. If peace were of purely psychological significance to the human person, the psychiatrists and their company would have given us the answer; if peace had only a material and social significance, the economists and revolutionaries would have delivered the goods.

False peace

Further, if peace were only the absence of conflict, social, political or economic, there need be no distinction between peace and appeasement. For appeasement is, after all, a sure way of avoiding conflict, at least temporarily. One side submits to the other and "peace" in a certain sense is maintained. Many of the nations who found themselves within the orbit of the ancient Pax Romana, or Pax Britannica, or their modern equivalents, would say that these patterns of peace had significance only for those with power to impose their "peace" on others. The "peace" of the lamb in the stomach of the lion is the very denial of peace for the lamb. Consequently, it has become customary to emphasize the necessity for peace with justice and honour.

While in political, social and personal realms peace may be "realized" in terms of appeasement or domination, so in the religious and intellectual spheres many seek peace or the avoidance of conflict and disharmony through syncretism — the "unholy" alliance and mingling of various standards of values. In this way all shades of opinion can be accepted and formed into an amalgam.

But peace, if it is to remain peace, cannot be achieved either through appeasement or through a compromise which reduces all values to a composite lowest common denominator, for then it degenerates into an illusion or a false peace.

The moral frustration of man

Biblical realism speaks of the redemption of man and history through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. In Him the course of history is renewed and man is offered hope and "the enabling grace" to live the redeemed life. Any program of world reform or human change which leaves out or soft-peddles this truth will savour of illusion and false idealism. This is why we have serious reservations about international fronts and programs which either make a superficial effort to syncretize all opinions for the sake of peace or which talk about changing systems through "changing human individuals".

The latter point is often made by members of the Moral Rearmament movement, but it is often difficult to understand what such a "change" in people really means. Sometimes in MRA literature the word seems to imply "adaptation". One publication which I saw in New Zealand used the example of the dinosaur which had become extinct because it did not change with the times! If that is the meaning, it definitely cannot be the same thing as "conversion" and "regeneration" for the Christian, who understand these to mean to accept and live by the truth and power of Jesus Christ who is the Judge of all times and all things.

Most MRA speakers talk about this "change" as implying a change to morality and moral ideals. To imply that man of himself can achieve absolute honesty, purity, unselfishness and love, is to forget the terrible indictment of the human condition without Christ, as described in Genesis 6 : 5 : "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually."

It is also to ignore the common human experience to which Paul refers when he says : "For I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do . . . Wretched man that

I am ! Who will deliver me from this body of death" (Romans 7 : 19, 24). Man's predicament is not that he does not appreciate what goodness is, but that he is incapable of resolving his moral frustration apart from Jesus Christ. The MRA analysis of the human situation is not sufficiently profound, and its hope of changing social systems merely through changing individuals reveals an unrealistic conception of the complex human social order.

The world's tragedy

Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr has said : "The Buchman movement, supposedly a revitalization of Christianity, but in reality the final and most absurd expression of the romantic presuppositions of liberal Christianity, has undertaken to solve all the problems of modern economics and politics by persuading individuals to live in terms of absolute honesty and absolute love. All the ordinary political techniques are disavowed in favour of a voluntary individualistic love absolutism. The real problems of the political order are understood so little." ¹

A report on the MRA published in England has this to say : "In this issue MRA is the opposite side of the coin to Marxism. Marxism suggests that all that is required is social change, so that the other side of the social revolution all human problems are solved : MRA suggests that all that is required is personal change — on the other side of which is the solution to all social problems. Both are half truths, and therefore falsehoods at this point ; both are shallow in their understanding both of the nature of the social problem and of the nature of evil in history. A biblical Christianity is profounder, both in its understanding of the social problems and in its understanding of the nature of evil." ²

The social problems of the world are not due only to personal immorality, and they are not therefore cured by personal morality alone. Genuine conversion in the Christian sense should lead a man far beyond personal moral standards to a

¹ *Interpretation of Christian Ethics*, p. 188.

² *Report on MRA* of the Social and Industrial Council of the Church of England Assembly, p. 8.

profound awareness and examination of the deep underlying causes of social crisis: the impact of technology and industry, geographical shrinkage of the world, the nature of modern power groups, and general human ignorance, all of which have contributed to the world's tragedy.

Reconciliation in Christ

Our affirmation is that only in the Cross of Christ will we understand the true meaning of the reconciliation of man and the redemption of history. For the Christian the real question is not so much one of a choice among different systems and patterns of peace, but rather one of the sources of peace. For him the question is not the type of peace to be sought, but rather, can true peace exist at all without acceptance of the Lordship of Jesus Christ and the knowledge of the meaning of His Cross? Unhappily no Christian can claim that his whole life is motivated by obedience to Christ and unswerving commitment to His redemptive work, but the fact that we are all bad Christians does not invalidate the primacy of Christ and the uniqueness of His redemption of the world. Nor is the Christian exonerated from the burden of his disobedience and unfaithful witness to His Lord.

History has meaning and significance, but true peace cannot be enjoyed by men apart from their acceptance of Jesus Christ and His Lordship. At the same time the full enjoyment of true peace is possible only beyond history. History and human life within it can, therefore, be assessed only in the light of the heavenly Kingdom which will be fully manifested only at the end of time. The Christian works for peace in this world, knowing the limitations imposed upon him by human nature and the historical situation in which he lives. So he proclaims through Jesus Christ the redemption of mankind and the renewal of history. Jesus Christ reconciles man to God and therefore reconciles man to man. He is our peace.

Is the Church a True Example of Peace ?

ROBERT C. MACKIE

The rapid growth of understanding and friendship between churches, which we call the ecumenical movement, dates from the Edinburgh International Missionary Conference of 1910. By the time of the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam in 1948 the churches were pledging themselves "to stay together". By the Second Assembly at Evanston in 1954 the international competence and influence of the churches had greatly increased, largely through the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs. We have good reason to be encouraged.

The Church's lack of influence

And yet ! During that same period of less than fifty years we can trace the steady deterioration of confidence among the nations which has led to two world wars and the present cold war. In January 1956, the British Prime Minister could say : "If there is less fear of world conflict today, that is due to the deterrent of nuclear weapons." New possibilities of destruction are apparently more powerful for peace than the example of the Church. The churches may have gained in their own inner solidarity ; they may even point to statements and suggestions which have been welcomed by peace-loving statesmen. But can we honestly say that the ecumenical movement among the churches has had a marked effect in preventing international conflict ?

Indeed a case can be made against the Church. Large masses have been taught to regard the churches in the West as war-mongering. It may be legitimate to dismiss such a sweeping accusation as due to prejudice and dishonest propaganda. But perhaps our extreme readiness at all times to do

so indicates a lurking bad conscience. Our brave statements about freedom and justice being preferable to slavery and oppression, even at the cost of destruction and death, sound a little hollow in an atomic age. And the way in which Christian ideals and anti-communist passions become confused is disquieting in the light of the record of the churches in history. The example of the Church may not only appear to be a bad one; it may sometimes be so.

Even among those who call themselves Christians there is grave dissatisfaction with the attitude of "the churches". Of course, the man in the pew, or the man who absents himself from the pew, is himself part of the Church which he criticizes. But he quite naturally separates himself from the organized Christian community and its leadership. His complaints about the churches are various according to his own convictions. But the complaint which goes deepest is one which is peculiarly difficult to answer, namely, why have the churches compromised on the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount and betrayed the categorical "non-resistance" position of their Master. Thousands upon thousands of troubled human spirits feel that, whatever they may be forced to do by society, the Church should take an unequivocal stand against war. The ordinary Christian may not know how such a stand on the part of the Church is to be related to his own duty as a citizen, but he knows that there is a categorical element in Christian teaching and believes it should be emphasized. If Christianity is true, the Church by its very existence should so influence mankind as to make the folly of war unthinkable. The fact that the Church is powerless to do this certainly weakens its hold upon masses of nominal Christians, and its influence upon non-Christians.

What the Church means by peace

This failure of the Church is heightened by its constant use of the word "peace". In the reading of the Bible, in prayer and in preaching, the word is always turning up, as if to mock men in their fear of war. The peace of God, which passes all understanding, may be a profound reality to the initiated, but it sounds to the outsider like a rather unworthy escape. The

peace of God, as promised by the Church, does seem to pass all understanding — it makes nonsense, if it has nothing to do with the earthly peace, which continues to elude mankind. In what sense, then, does the Church use the word ? What is its biblical meaning ?

Peace in the Bible is not the absence of conflict ; it means harmonious relationships, which make conflict impossible. Such relationships derive from justice, and true justice is the reflection in human affairs of the righteousness of God. In other words, men are only at peace in so far as they are living constructively with one another, and this involves obedience to the will of God. Peace among men springs from peace with God. This would be a vain endeavour, if Jesus Christ had not come into the world and made peace with God possible through the Cross. Peace, in the Christian sense, means the peace of those who are united by their common dependence upon the work of Jesus Christ. It follows, therefore, that Christian peace, biblical peace, the peace the Church knows about, is not the same as the peace the world seeks. Christian peace must always be prophetic in showing why the world's peace fails, and how in the end it may be secured.

So far so good. The Church cannot be expected to give the world easy answers. The teaching of the Sermon on the Mount does not translate directly into the political method of non-resistance. The Church has a secret which is profoundly related to the well-being of mankind, but it is not a secret which can be passed out as a panacea to a world which does not accept Jesus Christ as Lord. That is a hard doctrine, but it is understandable. The inference is that men should see true peace in the life of the Church, and be drawn to long for it, and to accept its conditions. But here comes another, and deeper, failure of the Church. It does not practise what it preaches. It is not in its own life a true example of the peace which it purports to profess.

Where the Church fails

The first, and most obvious, criticism which can be levelled at the churches in relation to their conception of peace, is that they cannot expect to promote unity among the nations when

they are divided among themselves. The ecumenical relations of the majority of Protestant, Anglican, and some Eastern Orthodox churches represent a hopeful trend towards unity. But the larger half of Christendom stands outside. There is no concerted approach to the lessening of international conflict by the Roman and non-Roman churches, because they are not agreed upon the nature of their own peace.

Secondly, the supra-national character of the Church, about which Christians sometimes boast, does not seem to work in practice. It is easy to point to national loyalties on the part of the churches which have not helped the nations to solve their problems. A glaring case is Cyprus. The chief exponent of the union of Cyprus with Greece is the Archbishop of Cyprus. He has to confer with Sir John Harding, who is himself a member of the Church of England. There is a certain misery about the whole costly dispute because Christian men on both sides deplore it. And yet the very real friendship between the Greek church and the British churches seems to point up the tragedy without helping to a solution.

A third point is the inability of the churches to secure a common mind as to the Christian attitude to war. All ecclesiastical statements on new weapons, or dangerous crises, have escape clauses or elusive paragraphs which enable the signatories to overlook their real differences of opinion. The resulting word cannot be decisive. The man in the street is aware that the churches have not really been able to agree to the practical issues, which affect him. Fourthly, and worst of all, is the shame of the Church — the quarrelsomeness of Christians. While there remain so many unresolved disagreements between churches, often conducted with bitterness, and sometimes invoking the law in settlement, the Church cannot be regarded as an example of peace. No Christian should forget that in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem it is a Moslem police force which prevents disturbances and rioting, when different Christian traditions meet to celebrate the Sacrament. For these reasons it is not easy for the Church to affirm that it knows the things which belong even to its own peace, much less the world's peace.

What the Church can do

Some readers may feel that this article is too destructive, perhaps even cynical, in its approach. The writer was asked to be realistic, and he has honestly tried ! It is important to counteract the glow of ecumenical righteousness, which invests all those who seek to commend the work of the World Council of Churches ! But we must surely all agree that the Church is not a true example of peace. It cannot honestly protest when the world ignores its witness. It can only point to Him, who was, and is, the true example of peace. And in doing so it will sometimes set a partial example in which it can take no pride, but which may challenge the world. Let us now look at some of the ways in which this can be done, and is being done.

The report on International Affairs at the Evanston Assembly said : "The foremost responsibility of the Christian Church in this situation is undoubtedly to bring the transforming power of Jesus Christ to bear upon the hearts of men." From one angle that is a statement of profound faith. The Church's influence for world peace can only be judged in the light of its total evangelistic task. From another angle the suggestion seems an escape from an immediate practical duty into the realm of pious but indefinite intention. It must appear in that light to the non-Christian who seeks the world's peace. There is only one way in which the general becomes relevant to the particular, and that is when the transforming power of Jesus Christ is seen at work in the Church itself. Can it be seen ? It certainly can. From time to time occasions arise when the attitude of national and social groups changes from negative to positive through the action of divine grace within the Church. There was such a change in attitude at Evanston itself on the part of Christians from either side of the great political division of our day. Many a World's Student Christian Federation conference has been the place where students, whom war has separated into groups which are filled with enmity, have become conscious of that transforming power in their lives.

The same report says : "Above all, Christians must witness to a dynamic hope in God in whose hands lie the destinies of nations, and in this confidence be untiring in their efforts to

create and maintain an international climate favourable for reconciliation and good will." A climate of confidence is an essential preparation for peace. Perhaps it was never more needed than it is today when men and nations have their attention fixed, like terrified moths, on the blinding symbols of nuclear warfare. In one of Sir Winston Churchill's last great speeches as Prime Minister he used the awful phrase: "... if God should ever weary of mankind". These are words to make the heart stop beating. Then the Christian must recall and assert that God has given in Jesus Christ the final "no" to that possibility. Yet the fact of man's folly remains. Almost at the same time another octogenarian, Dr. Cyril Garbett, the late Archbishop of York, wrote: "If the world is destroyed by their use (nuclear weapons) it would be to defeat the purpose for which God made it, a home in which all men and races might live together in fellowship." That is the correct "if". Man can destroy. But the dynamic hope of the Christian Church springs from the Cross, which was an apparent defeat of God's purpose, and in reality its victory. Conflict may be deterred by weapons, but reconciliation is only brought about by hope. Out of its hope in Christ the Church can create a climate of confidence, which is as infectious as fear! Just because nuclear warfare is not the last word for the Christian, the Church can show an example of serenity now, upon which in their desperation men may learn to rely.

A third Evanston statement reads: "For the Christian the ecumenical fellowship of the churches is evidence of progress towards this goal (peace) and of God's use of the Christian Church as one of the foundation stones of world order." Here we are again perilously near pride in the ecumenical movement. Yet as we look back, we know that the fellowship of the churches has been brought about in spite of confessional prejudices and national antipathies. If churches in their self-righteousness and instinct of self-preservation can be so visibly drawn together, there is hope for the nations! But the crux of the matter is whether God can use the Christian Church as one of the foundation stones of world order. After all, the Christian Church is a divided minority movement, with only a fraction of its members concerned for its integrity. Can that make a founda-

tion for order in this vast and troubled world ? There are signs worth noting. Political divisions have not always broken the Christian Church in two. The Christians in West Germany and the Christians in East Germany form one church today, perhaps as they never did before. The concern of Christians for one another's welfare across confessional and national frontiers did not stop with post-war reconstruction but persists and grows.

Even more significant has been the way in which Christian concern for refugees, and for all those in need, has gone far beyond the confines of the churches. It is the Christian churches, rather than Islam, which give their money, their goods and their love to help the Arab refugees in Palestine. Such actions are producing a sense of solidarity in the hearts of men, far more profound than the material resources would warrant. The Church can become one of the foundation stones of world order in so far as it builds upon its one foundation, which is Jesus Christ.

Finally, Evanston called "upon all Christians to join in prayer to Almighty God, that He will guide the governments and the peoples in the ways of justice and peace". Prayer is the Church's main function, not just its last resource. If the purpose of God is that the world should be "a home in which all men and races might live together in fellowship", then it is the duty and privilege of the Church to respond continually to that purpose in prayer. But prayer is also the most unifying of the Church's activities, pointing to the unity in Christ which underlies all its divisions. Therefore it is supremely the place where the Church can show an example of peace. And that example will be all the more effective, if it is focused on fervent, believing prayer in the name of Christ and is not confused with the aspirations of all men of good will. The Church prays for peace in the world, not out of habit or despair, but because it knows that it is the will of God for His children.

THE STUDENT WORLD CHRONICLE

PIERRE MAURY

November 27, 1890 - January 13, 1956

When the news of the death of Pierre Maury reached his many friends in France and throughout the ecumenical world, they became aware of a sudden void in their lives that nothing would fill. The warmest heart I have ever known had ceased to beat on earth. Ministers whose whole ministry had been marked by their contacts with him, innumerable lay men and women felt "something of an orphan" because he had gone — he, the sure counsellor and friend.

At the same time, one note dominates all others : thankfulness towards God who had given him to us.

We of the Federation are indebted to him in a special way : as leader of the French Movement in the 'twenties, as a member of the staff of the WSCF in the early 'thirties, he exerted a far-reaching influence on the life and thought of the Federation between the two wars.

Where lies the secret of his leadership ? First of all, in his message : the love of God possessed him and he could not but proclaim it ; and secondly, in a certain human quality : he knew how to enjoy life, and he had a lively interest in human beings — nothing truly human left him indifferent. The love of God was no theory with him ; it kindled his heart and developed in him an amazing gift of contact. He knew, with Paul, how to "become all things to all men". His interest in man was perfectly genuine, and this is what made it so attractive. In a time when there is a lot of talk on the art of communication, a ministry like Pierre Maury's reminds us that the secret of communication lies not so much in "methods" as, first of all, in the man himself and in the quality of his understanding and love.

Pierre Maury was born in southern France, of solid Huguenot stock. He had all the liveliness and intensity of the southerner, combined with common sense and humour, and a realistic approach to men and things. His preaching could be stern, and a lady of his parish once remarked that after listening to his sermons one needed to have lunch with him — then all his human side came to the fore !

He got his university degree at the Sorbonne, and this was also the beginning of his Student Movement career, as he became chairman of the local group. He studied theology in Montauban where his father was a professor.

He was in military training when the first world war broke out, and served all through, first as a soldier, then as an officer. These hard years, when he was every day face to face with death, put him in contact with men of all conditions of life. He shared their sufferings and problems. He was truly one of them. All his life he was to feel close to the man-in-the-street; he conversed with equal ease with the intellectual and the worker. I remember a day after the second world war when we travelled together in a crowded and noisy bus somewhere in southeast France. He looked around and said suddenly: "You see, these are *my* people." He felt part of the French people to the core. Munich, the French defeat in 1940, and, to the last, the North African situation, weighed heavily on his soul.

When he came back from the war in 1918 he was full of H. G. Wells and his *God, the Great Captain*. This may seem strange, given his theology of later years. But he always shared intensely in the trends of his time, even if he was on second thought to sift and reject. His theology has never been "static". It grew and deepened with the years; at every stage he spoke out of personal conviction with such force that it gripped those who listened to him. Karl Barth soon became the great influence which marked his theological thinking. But he never, like too many so-called "Barthians", just copied his master; he was no copy-conformer; he lived the great realities about God and man that Barth had helped him to rediscover. He expressed them in his own terms and became their exponent in his own original way.

The period which followed the first world war was chaotic; the students were probing for a message, asking for "solid food". Maury was one of those who helped the young generation in the French Reformed Church towards a biblically-founded positive faith. To quote one of his friends, himself a minister: there are "innumerable authors, ministers and laymen of the generation 1925-50 who owe to him the best of what they have become, and who might say that they were not quite sure of the love of God before Pierre Maury had proclaimed it to them, and were still less able to preach it before they heard him do so."¹

¹ R. de Pury, *Notre Chemin*, February 1956.

In 1925 Pierre Maury took a parish in Ferney-Voltaire near Geneva. Many Genevese crossed the frontier to hear him preach, among them Federation leaders such as W.A. Visser't Hooft and Francis Miller. He lectured in Geneva on Péguy and other contemporary writers, on St. Augustine, Luther and Pascal, and these lectures soon attracted men who stood far from the Church. The scope of his knowledge and interests allowed ever-widening contacts with the literary world. He was widely read and his interests ranged from theology, philosophy and sociology to detective stories — on which he claimed to be an expert! He was the director for many years of the periodical, *Foi et Vie*. He devoted special attention to contemporary writers, for he knew that it is in novels of the best type that we often gain the deepest insights into the spiritual struggle of our time. But he also knew that to all problems of man there is only one answer: Jesus Christ, God made man.

When Pierre Maury joined the Federation staff in 1931, the WSCF was at a turning point in its history. Under the impulse of a young team of leaders, it was rethinking its message, giving a new impulse to Bible study, encouraging university missions in a number of countries. Pierre Maury was one of the most dynamic elements in this ecumenical team. His ecumenical "dialogues" in *The Student World* were widely read throughout the university world. In international meetings — in spite of his stumbling English — he always got across what he wanted! And what he wanted was to bring people to the very centre of all faith and life. He was the evangelist whose main interest lay in man, never in organizations.

In 1934 Pierre Maury accepted an urgent call to become the second pastor in the parish of Passy in Paris. There he worked for the last twenty-two years of his life, side by side with another great ecumenical figure, Pastor Boegner. To him the pastoral care of a congregation was the greatest of all human callings and he gave himself to it heart and soul. He had other tasks beside this one: he lectured for a few years at the Theological Faculty and became the chairman of the French Reformed Church. This soon proved to be too much for his health. He had many serious warnings and finally kept "only" the parish — and ecumenical contacts with the World Council of Churches. But he was of those who have to spend all their strength to the last. His spiritual leadership went far beyond the geographical limits of the parish.

As he grew older his preaching became more and more centred on the joyful news of the grace of God. God loved the world: Christ died for all men. Some knew it, others did not know it yet, but all were equally the object of this self-giving love. And this love would

conquer at the last ! This was his hope, his prayer, his expectation. Not that he was, theologically speaking, a "universalist" ; he knew that man could reject the love of God. But he was himself too overwhelmed by that love not to entertain a secret hope that those who had not met it in this world would at the end "see" and "believe".

He thought a great deal about death. During the last summer he had lost several close friends and felt "surrounded by death". God has been merciful to him : he could serve His Lord to the last. On Sunday, January 8, he preached in Rabat, Morocco, on "My times are in thy hand" (Psalm 31 : 15). He lectured on Wednesday evening before taking his plane back to Paris. On arrival he felt weary, went to sleep and died twenty-four hours later.

One of the profound joys and blessings of his life has been his family. His wife, who before her marriage was the first national woman secretary of the French SCM, was the faithful companion who shared all the concerns of his ministry. Philippe Maury has inherited the ecumenical vocation of his father. His second son is a minister, his daughter married a minister. All are in the service of the Church — the Church, his first and greatest love on earth.

Pierre Maury would not have liked his friends to make an idealized portrait of him ; he had his weaknesses like all men, and he knew them ; his message was all about God's grace, never about human achievements. But we have seen God's power at work in a man, and thank Him for it.

SUZANNE DE DIÉTRICH

Christians and War in the Atomic Age ¹

The Amsterdam Assembly (of the World Council of Churches) called for a theological discussion and study on the Christian attitude to war, which for various reasons was not directly taken up. National studies, however, have appeared in past years, notably in Britain and America. Theological discussion between pacifists and non-pacifists has continued, somewhat intermittently, and without substantial prospect of the resolution of differences. The Evanston Assembly reiterated the need for theological study, but did not suggest terms of reference.

¹ Reprinted from the *Bulletin* of the Division of Studies of the World Council of Churches, No. 2, p. 6.

The immediate concern of the Division is the problem of the prevention of war. It is recognized that this negative aim cannot stand alone, but must be attained by positive steps for the establishment of peace. It need hardly be said that there is a deep anxiety and perplexity among our constituency concerning the Christian attitude to armaments in this atomic age. There is the feeling that the results of nuclear research add a dimension to the situation which presents a new challenge to the Christian conscience. Again, modern war requires a total warfare which the Christian must face afresh on the basis of theological convictions. On the other hand, there are those who, in spite of these facts, feel that the essential problem has not been changed. For many the problem of security, and the Christian understanding of it, is fundamental. All of these matters raise important theological issues which should be discussed in an ecumenical context.

The Division of Studies is therefore developing a study and promoting an ecumenical discussion on the general subject: Christians and the Prevention of War in an Atomic Age — a Theological Discussion.

Theological discussion

The importance of this being principally a theological discussion, as distinguished from a merely political one, must be emphasized. So deep is the division among Christians at this point, and not only along pacifist – non-pacifist lines, that first principles of theological conviction must be examined. Moreover, the concrete issues raised are searching and far-reaching to a degree that the fundamentals of Christian faith are involved in their treatment.

The study will be undertaken by two methods. The first is the work of a commission composed of laymen and clergy, theologians, scientists and historians. This commission will meet at least twice to develop a statement on the general subject and upon the specific questions raised. The second means of inquiry involves as wide a discussion of the subject in the member churches as possible. It is hoped that this discussion will be stimulated by the reports of the commission and in some degree directed toward these reports.

Readers of the *Bulletin* and interested groups are asked to help us by commenting now upon the issues suggested for the commission to study.

The chief point of the study, in whatever terms it may be actually phrased, lies in a consideration of the Christian attitude toward war in the new form it has taken in our time. It is clear that World War II, and especially the developments since, have brought forth

a conception and technic of warfare in which there are new elements of such towering dimensions as to change the character of warfare, and therefore to force the Christian to think through his attitude toward it again. Perhaps the most basic factor in the situation is the apparent uncontrollability of modern war. Destruction cannot now be pinpointed, if destruction so far revealed of the effect of nuclear bombs is any gauge. Organization is required which sometimes cannot be contained for the purposes of war, but engulfs the total society with social effects which themselves become the dominating factors. Ideological forces must be employed which, once set loose, have effects upon masses of men which escape control. The requirements of preparedness and defence seem to be caught by the demands of political and scientific and military logic, and appear therefore more to determine our decisions rather than to be controlled by them.

Serious questions of theological and ethical principles are therefore urgently raised. None of the traditional positions of the Church, as illustrated for instance by the three positions recorded at the Amsterdam Assembly, admit that there is more than a lesser evil involved in warfare. If, however, war becomes an uncontrolled and uncontrollable social act, can it be regarded as a lesser evil to be used for a limited and qualified end? This, as will be readily recognized, is not to ask the traditional pacifist questions about war, which are fundamentally based upon the conviction that it is wrong to take life. It is much more to raise the question of analysis as to whether modern war in its full sense can be controlled and used for a stated end, and to raise the theological issue as to whether the use of an uncontrolled means of ethically ambiguous character can be supported by Christians.

Even as these questions are put, the ethical demands made upon Christians by the international situation in which we live must be kept in mind. The political and economic pressures which lead nations to defend themselves by arms cannot be ignored in any consideration of modern war. Moreover, it is a fact of the present international situation that massive armaments are acting as a deterrent to war, and a stimulus to finding a peaceful settlement of differences. What is the significance of this fact? Is it something of the present moment only, a phase in the struggle, or is there something more basic in it? If, for instance, a kind of peace is being built upon fear of the consequences of war, how should the Christian react to, and how should the Church minister to, that situation? From whatever angle the problem is viewed, urgent and perplexing issues are raised.

Specific issues

Within this general complex of problems, three concrete points have been suggested for inquiry.

The first involves a series of questions concerning the relation of man to the created world, as this problem arises in fresh perspective in the atomic age. One aspect of the continuing problem of the relation between scientific inquiry and religious truth is thus brought out sharply. The old quarrel between the Church and science was a dispute which had to do with the defence of the Christian conception of life. The present problem is far different. It concerns the consequences for the life of man himself in the great thrust of science, in which Christian and non-Christian, scientist and layman, alike are involved, and which has produced the portentous results of nuclear research. What does Christian faith say, not about science in its narrow sense, although that may be wrapped up in the larger issue, but about the relation of mankind to the creation? to the use of the creation? to the destruction of the creation? What ethical disciplines emerge from the underlying theological affirmations which should be made in response to these fundamental questions?

The second area of inquiry is in a different realm. Modern war is total war. Atomic warfare underlines the point. What does this fact mean for the Christian who is engaged in the processes of defence? From what theological vantage point does the Christian act when he is not merely confronted with this situation but inextricably involved in it? In the present scene, ideological claims are made in connection with the efforts for defence and in connection with war which leave no place for the personal ethical decisions of the Christian. Yet Christians cannot escape the situation, nor fail to participate in it. What theological convictions should lie at the root of the attitude which the Church, the People of God, should take? Upon what basis should Christian witness be made?

Thirdly, beyond these factors involved in the prevention of war, yet also part of them, are the problems of peace-making. In much of the world, the great word is security. In other parts, it is justice. What is the Church's understanding of security in an atomic age? and of justice? These are in part political and economic questions, but they are, far more importantly, profound spiritual questions, striking at one of the most sensitive aspects of Christian witness in the modern world.

The Division is aware that, in undertaking this new study, it is entering upon one of the most difficult and controversial aspects of contemporary Christian life and work. It therefore asks for help to the end that the study may contribute to clarity of understanding and to a decisive witness.

Young People and the Peaceful Use of Atomic Power

We are reprinting here extracts from an article by Tore Littmark, Secretary for Young Men's Work of the World's Alliance of YMCAs, first published in a special issue of World Communique, magazine of the Alliance, put out in connection with a study project on "Young People and the Peaceful Use of Atomic Power" being undertaken by the Alliance in 1956. Study kits with documentation on the topic are available from its office in Geneva, and a seminar for leaders is to be held at the International Centre, Castle Mainau, Germany, May 15-23.

The immediate reaction of many individuals who study articles about the Geneva Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy... may very well be, "This concerns me". Facing the new problems and opportunities that are bound to come in a period of the rapidly increasing use of atomic power, the YMCA, as a Christian world youth movement, must say, "This concerns our Movement".

I. We face a choice of life and death as never before in the history of mankind. The results of this choice for the entire population of the world are obvious. It seems to be clear, at least to all the leading nuclear scientists, that a world war in which all the powers of atomic fission are used will be the end of mankind, for some of us immediately and for others slowly. It will not be "just another world war" as some put it ironically. Atomic power is not just another type of power that has been discovered, similar in kind to electricity or the power of steam. Its modes of use and its quantitative effect are so great as to require each one of us to begin to think in new terms and categories. Every thoughtful person is forced to reconsider the basic problems of life, to rethink social, political and economic questions as well as the problems of war and peace.

If scientists agree — and they seem to do so — that an atomic war will be the end of the human race, and if they tell the world's statesmen this fact — and they have done so — this does not mean that the problem is thereby solved. Conflicts may arise in which neither side intended at the start to use atomic weapons, but then under pressure resorted to them "as a last chance". History is filled with those whose attitude was "after-me-the-deluge"; political and military leaders will surely not be exempt from this in an atomic war.

Much is now being said and written about the peaceful use of atomic power, but this does not exclude the possibility of an atomic

war. It does mean that in addition to our attempts at *preventing* something, we can now use *constructive* new means as we work for peace. Building for peace is a challenge to youth, an effort in which everyone can take part. It is not only for atomic scientists, the determinative few, but for each one of us...

2. **If we choose life...** that is to say if most of the nations, including the big powers on both sides of the iron curtain, agree on a prohibition of atomic warfare and on a full-scale development of atomic energy for peaceful uses, and if the benefits of this revolution are made available to as many nations as possible, what will all this mean to us and for us? What is the price of peace within and among the nations in an atomic age?

Many feel that it will require an international order, a system of justice under law with the police power necessary to see that agreements that are made are carried out and not broken unilaterally by one or more contracting states. Such an authority should have the power to control and prevent preparations for war; it should also be responsible for seeing that the benefits of atomic energy are shared fairly among the nations, big and small. Unless the "have countries" in terms of scientific development and capital available for investment do this wholeheartedly, the differences that exist between Western Europe and North America and the so-called "under-developed" countries will only be further aggravated. Much is already being done on a "voluntary" basis. But is it enough? Is it likely that the people of the Western countries will be ready to slow down improvements in their standards of living in order to benefit other less developed areas, unless there is an international organization with the power necessary to see that justice is practiced?...

But it is not only in the political realm that we face a revolutionary demand. It seems probable that ahead of us lies a social and economic revolution whose consequences for young people will be even more turbulent and upsetting than were those of the Industrial Revolution which gave rise to our Movement. Particularly in the less developed areas, it could bring about a development in social organization and standards of living for which people are neither mentally nor morally prepared. *In their daily work, many more people will become enmeshed in even more complicated technical settings* as atomic power is utilized for a mechanized civilization through automation built on the use of electronics. As more and more young people move rapidly to new work opportunities, they will become increasingly uprooted mentally and socially.

For all its possible benefits, the peaceful use of atomic power does not automatically ensure that there lies ahead of us a rosy

terrestrial Garden of Eden into which we can ride on the self-propelled limousine coat-tails of the atomic scientists. We cannot go along for the ride simply because we happened to be born at the dawn of the atomic age. Whether we like it or not, we are faced as Christians and as a Christian youth movement with decisions, a challenge and a number of questions.

3. What does the peaceful use of atomic energy require from a responsible Christian young person? First of all we must learn what it is all about. We need knowledge of the facts. This does not mean that we are called to fathom the mysteries of nuclear research ; but *we do need to know that the atomic age is here and something of the ways in which atomic power can be used for peaceful purposes*. As Christians we must rid ourselves of the general lack of knowledge or even interest that prevails even in countries with a leading position in the development of nuclear power...

By and large the churches acted and spoke their word too late in regard to the Industrial Revolution. What will happen this time ? Will we once again be too late with too little or are we ready to witness in word and deed in the New Age ? We need to study the impact of these new discoveries on our Christian faith and *vice versa*. They have something to say to us about the relationship between the Creator and His creation, about the use of the creation and its destruction and about the ethical principles needed for the handling of this new force. What is God's purpose in revealing atomic power and what is His will for its use ; what judgment does He place over us in our freedom ; what limitations does He place upon human knowledge ?

We must learn to approach this new and complex situation in Christian faith and confidence. There is no better preparation for catastrophe than fear. Too many people regard atomic power as the equivalent of atomic war. As Christians we dare to believe that this power was given to us by God for good things...

4. What does the peaceful use of atomic energy require from a world Christian youth movement? As a world movement we must be able to plan ahead for our work in a society in which a growing number of young people will have even greater responsibilities in still more complex working conditions. We must foresee what will happen in areas of rapid social change. We must learn to operate as a world movement in order to see what should and what should not be brought into these areas. This means an education both of "sending" and of "receiving" movements in our world brotherhood.

We will probably have to face a time when young people will have more hours away from their places of work. Free time, for what? *The need for a constructive, positive use of leisure time will be even greater than now.* One can only guess what this means in terms of program planning and needs for equipment, and leaders both lay and professional.

Our Movement is often involved in vocational guidance. We must now be aware of the fact that nuclear science and the fields of technical work related to it have needs and provide opportunities. It has been said that the greatest obstacle to the development of the use of atomic power is not the problem of capital investment, but the lack of trained personnel. It is quite clear that before atomic power can be satisfactorily used in under-developed areas, there must be immense preparatory work; this will require large numbers of people involved in educational and technical industrial work. This is a calling for many young Christians and a call to our Movement.

Our Movement is not political, but that does not mean, and may not mean, that politics are taboo in our program. On the contrary, we have now got to face a still greater *need for education for civic responsibilities.* Too often we as Christians have considered the "dirty job" of politics as something we should not touch. The pious excuses were often very nice but could not hide the fact that Christ has taught us to be *in the world.* These words, written by Dr. Wyne A. R. Leys, Vice-President and Dean of Faculties at Roosevelt College, Chicago, are a good reminder to our Movement of one of the big tasks ahead:

In a world of human diversity and ingenuity, peace is not conducive to peace of mind. Peace means noisy debate. Peace means uncertainty and many of the irritations that we associate with the "cold war". The impact of atomic energy, like the impact of other life-complicating inventions, is widening the gap between public necessities and personal satisfactions. To secure the benefits of atomic energy without a massacre, we must maintain political processes that are unpleasant and nerve-wracking.

The release of atomic energy is completing the destruction of the isolation of human communities. It probably means more gigantic human organizations. It creates industries that affect the public interest not only in a national sense but in an international sense. Education for the politics of such a society must build an appreciation of negotiations that resolve conflicts, no matter how annoying and personally offensive the infighting.

A choice of life and death? Yes indeed, it is a choice which all of us are facing. In one way it is something new; in one way it is a repetition of the old words: Choose this day whom you will serve.

An Exchange of Letters

February 1955

Brothers and sisters in the world who are united in the name of our Lord

On the Universal Day of Prayer for Students, we are glad to send to you our greeting from Japan with a hearty prayer. With what happiness and gratitude it is that we students all over the world can pray together, in the midst of the tensions in the world today. We are convinced that our fellowship in Christ is the real sustenance and the motivating power for our lives, when we face great responsibilities as youth and as Christians.

We have realized through the messages from our fellow Movements that we are not isolated from each other in our struggles with various difficult problems, but we are part of the world Christian fellowship, striving towards righteousness and freedom.

With great earnestness, we sincerely wish to tell you the problems which we are facing now and want to ask you to remember us in your prayers. Uppermost in our minds is the atomic and hydrogen bomb. Ten years ago, we Japanese lost a great number of lives by atomic bombs, the worst weapon in history. Since the end of the war, we have striven hard for peace, and for the reconstruction of our land. But again the hydrogen bomb has brought great fear to us. As you may know, the experiment of the hydrogen bomb carried out by the United States of America in the Pacific Ocean last March, brought great suffering to twenty-three Japanese fishermen, one of whom later died, leaving his wife and children. And still now, people in Japan are living in great fear.

Can such a terrible thing be overlooked that men rob others of their lives who are made by the will of God? It is only we Japanese who know this terrible situation and have had these unfortunate experiences. Therefore, we are convinced that we ought to help others in the world know about this. And we want to pray and do our best together with you, to remove this fear and uncertainty from our minds. In this connection, we remember with great gratitude the message from the United Student Christian Council in the United States regarding this matter which was a source of great encouragement to us¹.

At the same time, we see many problems which we have to solve and reform in Japanese society. At the end of the war ten years ago, we approved the new democratic constitution which renounced war and building up of armaments. But unfortunately, the tendency in our society is going towards the renunciation of this admirable

¹ See *The Student World*, I, 1955, p. 72.

constitution. Many reactionary politicians are supporting rearmament, involving the expenditure of great amounts of money, despite the fact that a majority of the people are really seeking peace. Nevertheless, their promise of peace is now going to be broken off, and democracy is at a great crisis.

Ought we as Christians to keep silent in this situation? Who else can build up real democracy based upon Christianity, if we do not?

It is not a too optimistic understanding of the present international situation, but our unfortunate war experiences that make us oppose the present rearmament and hydrogen bomb experiments. Today Japan is at the crucial turning point where she will go either forward or backward. This is why we need the guidance of our Lord and your hearty prayers as we strive hard to establish a new Japanese society.

While we sinners have been forgiven through the love of God shown in Jesus Christ, and want to experience the joy of salvation, the peace of this world is still greatly menaced. Can we who live in peace with God escape from our responsibility of doing our best to realize peace in the world? We are convinced that our way to live is related to the way shown by Jesus Christ, and that we ought to follow Him, bearing our own cross.

On this Universal Day of Prayer for Students, we are planning to have meetings all over Japan to pray for the world.

We want to close this greeting with an adoration of the name of our Lord, without whom we could not be one.

In the name of our Saviour,

KIYOKO OSUZU
National Student Chairman
YWCA in Japan

TATSUO HAMABE
National Student Chairman
YMCA in Japan

September 1955

Dear Brothers and Sisters united through Jesus Christ

Greetings from the National Student Council of the YMCA and the YWCA, meeting in Delaware, Ohio.

We wish to express to you our grateful appreciation for your letter of February 1955, in which you have so vividly conveyed the concerns and fears which we ourselves sincerely share. We are fully aware that it is only you and your country who know at first hand the terrible effect of the atomic and hydrogen bombs. It is tragic that once again you should suffer loss and that your country should live under a cloud of fear. It is with a profound sense of nearness to you through Christ that we share in the grief which you have experienced and for which we are responsible. We confess our failure

as Christians to search ardently for all possible ways to reduce world tensions rather than acquiescing in the building up of armaments. We know that nations must use instruments of power, but that it is the responsibility of all persons to find and support ways to reduce causes of world tensions, especially in this day of weapons which can destroy all the achievements of civilization.

We admit our failures and unite in the affirmation of the ultimate power and justice of God's will. We pledge ourselves to support actively measures for international disarmament; to work for the outlawing of war; to oppose further United States action influencing Japan to rearm; to support the statement in the Report of the World Council of Churches on International Affairs (referring to atomic weapons) "... that nations carry on tests only within their respective territories, or if elsewhere, only by international clearance and agreement".

In addition to this responsibility which we accept as individuals, we urge our Associations, which are autonomous, to share our concern by studying the following questions:

Should the United States restrict the testing of atomic weapons to its own continental boundaries?

What alternatives can we as Christians offer to the pressure now being exerted on Japan toward rearmament?

Can we as Christians be satisfied with anything less than the unconditional outlawing of war?

We urge our Associations to pledge themselves to any responsible actions which seem indicated by their study. We urge them to implement their decisions in the following areas: (1) on their campuses by encouraging the exchange of students between the United States and Japan and by establishing a closer community with those Japanese students who are already on the campus, and by sharing their concerns; (2) in our nation's decisions by informing congressmen of their opinions and by encouraging legislation which supports their convictions; (3) throughout the world by supporting policies of the United Nations which are in accord with these decisions.

We want you to know that we are overwhelmed by the terrible burden which our country bears to use its tremendous resources and power responsibly. Both you and we are called to work for a clearer understanding of God's purpose for our common life. We each have only a partial understanding of God's truth because of the limitations of our own historic settings. We can help each other. Already, by your communication you have helped us. We trust you will join us in continuing to exchange insights and concerns, to the end that together we may help to achieve world peace in brotherhood under the Lordship of Jesus Christ.

LINDA BACON PAUL SCHRADING
Co-chairmen, National Student Council YMCA-YWCA

A GERMAN TRAVEL DIARY

ALICE OTTERNESS

Appropriately, my first Federation trip in Germany began in Stuttgart, headquarters of the *Evangelische Studentengemeinde in Deutschland* (ESGiD). From this starting point I had a quick look at almost every variety of *Studentengemeinde* they had to offer: Stuttgart itself, serving the *Technische Hochschule* and an art school; Tübingen, one of the most famous old university towns in Germany and Europe; Germersheim, the site of a very small interpreters' school; Weingarten, where a pedagogical institute is located, not only in an almost totally Roman Catholic area, but in the wing of the famous Roman Catholic Weingarten Cathedral; and then Berlin with its complexities, difficulties and richness. Little wonder that I returned to Geneva weary but with a deepened respect for the present expression of the SCM in Germany, the movement to which my own background of the Lutheran Student Movement in America had made me feel especially close.

Paulinenstrasse

Although chronologically my visit with the Stuttgart *Studentengemeinde* came first, I think my impressions of the Paulinenstrasse 40 headquarters deserve precedence. During my stops there, I had a chance to live for a short time with their on-going office routine and was impressed with the efficiency (all sizes and varieties of modern technological achievements in the form of addressographs, mimeograph machines, etc.), the combination of order and informality, and, most vividly, the team spirit which seemed to be present.

They are justly proud of their new venture, *Ansätze*, a magazine done in a style more contemporary and sophisticated than any SCM publication I have seen. Not to be outdone, the new *Akademikerschaft* movement for graduates, directed by the former General Secretary, Horst Bannach, was sending out the very week I was there several thousand copies of the first edition of its equally striking monthly, *Radius*. This emphasis of doing everything "first-class" and often at deceptively low cost is an achievement worth imitating. It is only one example of the high calibre leadership which Peter Kreyszig, their General Secretary, is giving, a kind of leadership which is dissatisfied with mediocrity.

The diversity of gifts and experience among the present staff seems most productive. Peter and Christoph Rhein, the Interna-

tional Secretary, are refreshingly complementary, and the addition of Odeh Suardi, Fraternal Secretary from Indonesia, has also been mutually beneficial to him and to the ESGiD.

The practice of having a student leader (this year Christoph Hahn) in the office seems to me an excellent way of keeping a student program relevant and in touch with the constituency it is designed to serve.

Stuttgart

I spent the first Sunday in Advent with the Stuttgart SG¹. This was a festive day since their new student house, the Max-Ehlers-Heim, was being dedicated. Besides having very adequate facilities for the SG to meet in small and large groups, it also had rooms for eighty-five young workers from the DDR (German Democratic Republic) and sixty-five students, both fellows and girls.

Their previous centre had been a barracks, so this modern house, decorated in very good taste, was quite a change. One of the questions posed by Christoph Rhein in the greetings he brought to the afternoon meeting was whether or not they were also ready to make the appropriate change in their SG program that such a new building demanded. Stuttgart is located in the district of the state church of Württemberg, one of the most conservative and pietistic areas in Germany. The implications of this context for the SG are obvious.

Sunday was a full day, beginning with a worship service in one of the large Stuttgart churches. There are 4,000 Protestant students studying in Stuttgart, and I would guess that at least 1,000 were in church. Since the afternoon festivities began at 2.30 and continued with only a break for coffee until 8.30, I was introduced to the German talent of being able to sit in meetings for very long stretches. The schedule included several clever parodies on some of the major problems encountered in building a new house (should the windows open *in* or *out*?), a series of greetings, including my premier attempt at *Herzliche Grüsse* (heartly greetings) in German, an Advent Cantate sung by the SG choir, and last, a group reading of one chapter from the Dorothy Sayers' drama, *The Man Born to be King*.

It wasn't until the next evening, when visiting the Bible study hour, that I had a chance to get acquainted with some of the student leaders and see some of the regular life of the SG. One of the most interesting developments taking place is the attempt to strengthen the relationship of the young workers with the students living in

¹ This abbreviation of *Studentengemeinde* will be used throughout the rest of this Travel Diary.

the house. Their first meeting together had been held Sunday night after the dedication day activities were over, and Christoph Hahn, the student leader, who also lives at the Max-Ehlers-Heim, felt some progress had been made. The SG has four small study circles, and it was interesting to learn that the currently popular one was on the devil and hell in literature and in the Bible.

The Bible study was led by the pastor from the *Patengemeinde* in Dresden, who had come especially for the dedication services. It was immediately evident that the *Patengemeinde* idea is taken very seriously by the SGs in both parts of Germany and this was happily confirmed in every SG I visited¹. Likewise the style of the Bible study was almost identical in each place: in the course of four visits I heard hour-long expositions on Romans, I John, Daniel, and the Second Article of the Apostles' Creed. Unfortunately I was always hurried away to a discussion *other* than the small group which met to discuss the content of the lecture, so I got a very one-sided view of their Bible study hour. This is the event attended by the largest number of students, except for the special worship services held occasionally during the semester, and I suppose that Bible study thus becomes at once the most admirable and the most vulnerable aspect of the SG program. One is impressed by the loyalty and interest which so many students show in straight biblical exegesis, but also disappointed that for the large majority of students who attend and do not go to the small group discussion afterwards, it is almost a straight lecture with neither opportunity nor encouragement for questions and response.

Tübingen

Going by train from Stuttgart through Esslingen, Plochingen, Wandlingen, Nitzingen, Nürtingen, and Reutlingen, I arrived at Tübingen and was met by the *Vertrauenstudent* (student leader) and was introduced into the life of a very large SG. There are 3,500 Protestant students there and the SG has 400 to 500 members. During my one-day visit in this famous old university town I had an opportunity to get impressions about many facets of a well-developed SG under the pastoral leadership of Pastor Konrad Weyman. A few of these impressions centered around the following ideas:

Position of Vertrauensstudenten: I was impressed with the fine relationship which the pastor had with his *Vertrauensstudenten* and

¹ Each SG in Western Germany has a SG in the DDR for which it feels particularly responsible and with which it keeps in close contact through conferences, correspondence and mutual exchange.

how much responsibility he vested in them. One minor incident seemed symbolic to me of their sense of partnership in spiritual leadership, when the *Vertrauensstudent* gave the benediction following the weekly Bible study attended by about 200 students. Even in the most "democratic" American student groups, the students usually resort to the pastor to "pronounce the benediction".

Responsibility to and of the intelligentsia : Both of these concerns seemed evident in the program emphases at Tübingen. Two of the coming *Evangelische Hochschultage* (days when their meetings are especially designed to reach the whole campus) were on the subjects, "Nature and Formation of the Elite" and "The Problem of the Right Distribution of Property". In addition, Pastor Weyman was having a meeting with the leaders of the *Korporationen*, the revived fraternities in German universities, on the question of labour unions.

Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship : This is a problem at Tübingen and there has been a rather sizeable Inter-Varsity group there for a few years now, led by one of the professors of the theological faculty. Consequently, in the discussion after the evening Bible study which I had with a group of about twenty students, this was one of the main subjects of conversation. The problem of Inter-Varsity is doubly complicated in Tübingen which, like Stuttgart, is located in the district of Württemberg. It was on this evening, when describing the Baptist church in my best German, I confused the two words *Taufe*, meaning baptism, and *Teufel*, meaning devil, and said that the Baptists had the *Teufel* at about twelve years of age!

Foreign Students : An announcement was made at the Bible study hour encouraging students to invite foreign students to spend the Christmas holidays with them. For those who were not invited to homes, an excursion to the *Evangelische Akademie* in Bad Boll was planned.

Et cetera : The most enjoyable moments in Tübingen were spent in the Adolf-Schlatter-Haus, enjoying the Weyman family of several children, and also the "family" of the *Vertrauensstudenten*. The two fellows and two girls had rooms there and had many of their meals in common. This is always the practice for the *Vertrauensstudenten* during the semester they are serving, and I think it is a good one. With more than twenty small discussion groups, their regular weekly Bible studies, plus daily worship services and weekly Communion, they, together with the pastor, have far more than enough to do. Fortunately a *Vikar* has just been added to give assistance to the pastor. This is the first time that one of the state churches has given two of its men to a student parish.

Despite the very live character of this SG, I felt disappointed that so few students seemed interested in what was happening with the students in other parts of the world. This was no doubt due to the language barrier of my halting German, although many of them speak English. It seemed that one of the few things I could make them excited or curious about was the large number of denominational student groups in America. And in this discussion I found them a bit naively complacent about the ecumenical character of their own SGs—in other words, they took for granted a privileged situation which is not entirely clear theologically, even though it is obviously an excellent *and* effective means of witnessing in the university.

While I was there, Pastor Weyman was facing the decision of whether or not he should become a chaplain to the new German armed services. I have since heard that he has decided to leave the SG for this purpose.

Germersheim and Weingarten

Germersheim is one of the smallest SG in Germany. The enrollment at the interpreters' school is not large but it has a good reputation. There are only about thirty in the SG, mostly girls. I arrived in the afternoon and talked with the pastor until eight o'clock, when the girls began arriving at his home for the evening Bible study. He led them in a study of a chapter from the book of Daniel, I spoke for less than ten minutes, since they were eager to get on with the next part of the program, and then we listened to a recording of Bach's Christmas Cantate until the girls went home. I left again early the next morning. Thus my contact with the students was very, very limited, but they apparently appreciated my visit more than any other place, probably because they are such a small (and, they may think, insignificant) group.

The pastor here is quite new and is just getting acquainted with his work. He is also a superintendent and has several congregations for which he is responsible, but in spite of this busy schedule, he is giving faithful pastoral care to this small group. The students have a morning service every day and he leads a worship one evening of the week in addition to the meeting for Bible study. This group was sending a Christmas package to their *Patengemeinde* in East Germany.

Some of the girls were interested in securing positions as secretaries and translators in the international ecumenical offices in Geneva. They proved their abilities as translators after I left by sending me an English translation of a German Advent hymn of

which I had become very fond after hearing it sung in every SG during this first week of Advent.

The circumstances in which the SG at the pedagogical institute at Weingarten lives are most interesting, since the institute is located in one of the wings of the famous baroque Roman Catholic cathedral. The area is almost completely Roman Catholic, but the little SG has been growing steadily since its beginnings only a few years ago. There are almost eighty active members out of a Protestant enrollment of 110.

Happily my visit coincided with the *Adventfeierntag*, the biggest event of the year for the SG. The event was held in the local Protestant church and attended by 125 townspeople and students, including the Roman Catholic director of the institute who brought greetings. The careful preparations for the evening included hand-painted place cards for every one and several excellent choral numbers from the choir, some in contemporary harmony.

The quality of students studying here was unusually good. The *Vertrauensstudent*, for instance, is as widely read in contemporary German and American literature as many Harvard students whom I knew in my work there last year. These future primary and secondary school teachers were talking about such phrases as *Menschenbild*, the picture of modern man, with a facility that was quite impressive. They were very excited about discussions they had recently had with the theological students from Tübingen on questions of teaching religion in the schools and felt that the theological students did not appreciate the possibilities for lay people in this field.

The strict schedule under which the students live seemed very adolescent to me and they were quite rebellious about it. They are in classes forty-three hours a week, classes begin at seven every morning and they have very little time for individual study. All of the students live at the institute, so the community atmosphere (in the opposite wing from the monastery) is more like American small-college life than anything else I saw in Germany. On the other hand, they were complaining that there were only two small rooms in the building where the fellows and girls could be together informally.

A small Protestant group had existed in this institute for several years, but it was only during the years that Erna Fast, fraternal worker from the United States, was working with pedagogical institutes for the ESGiD in 1948-49 that it became an officially related SG.

My visit there heightened my interest in the whole question of our responsibility to teacher training colleges. They reflect many

of the same weaknesses as American teacher training institutions, but at the same time they are at the heart of one of the most crucial areas in any nation's life.

Berlin

My flight into Berlin took place under conditions that have always made such good "Travel Diary" atmosphere — a heavy blanket of grey clouds cut off any view of the DDR as I flew from Stuttgart to Berlin, and it was a quick transference to think of the less visible but more effective cover that cuts us off from contact with our brothers there.

The week of my visit was the same week that two American congressmen had been arrested in East Berlin and the Soviet Union had declared that East Berlin was no longer the Russian sector of the city but the capital of the DDR. The whole question of truck and barge shipments into Berlin was also a matter of continuing concern for the city. In short, even though the city is never in a relaxed mood now, I felt that this week was one of particular tension. "Politics" for the people in Berlin is not a particular area of life which they can view in a detached way; but on the contrary the whole life of these people, and particularly students, is involved in the daily currents and changes of the political scene. A recent ruling had been made, for instance, forbidding all East German students studying in West Berlin to go to their homes for the Christmas holidays. The disappointment of everyone following the second Geneva conference was also evident. "Bluff in Berlin" was the title of the front page editorial in the *Manchester Guardian* for that week.

My personal impression was that something like a proud despair had come over the residents of Berlin, in contrast to what I had seen there in the summer of 1952 when the atmosphere seemed charged with hope. In spite of this, however, Berlin has a spirit all its own, the street car drivers have a sense of humour, and there is still an intellectual and cultural life going on which seems determined to rise above the problems, or at least to give a breath of fresh air to the people. I noticed, for instance, that a lecture was to be given in West Berlin on the subject "Kierkegaard and Rilke".

The most significant part of my Berlin visit was getting acquainted with the Berlin office of the ESGiD and our people there, Gerhard Bassarak and Elisabeth Adler. They are living in East Berlin and have identified themselves completely with the situation of the students in the DDR. The amazing thing is the way they are able to do this with perspective and without dramatization and sentimentalization. Hans-Jürgen Boyke, an architecture student, is the student leader this year, and they have also added another member to the staff, Miss Devrient, who will serve for only a year and a half before her marriage, but who will take the place of Elisabeth Adler who finishes her work some time this summer. After

her more than five years of very effective service with the ESGid she will be sorely missed by students and pastors alike.

In one way, I think I was unprepared for the visit, both by virtue of language and experience. On the other hand, for my work with the Federation and my orientation into the European scene, I think it was a very wise decision that I made the trip so soon. The people there spoke with joy and gratitude about the special relationship that the Federation has continually maintained with them through the visits of Leila Giles Bailey, Kyaw Than and Marie-Jeanne Coleman, and the meeting of the Executive Committee in Berlin in 1951.

During the ten days I was there I visited the SG at Humboldt University in East Berlin; met with students from Potsdam and Eberswalde from the DDR, who came to East Berlin especially for the meeting; visited the SGs in West Berlin, the Free University and the Technical University, and attended the small working conference for the DDR.

In addition to this more formal side of the visit, I was escorted around the city, both East and West, so that I had a chance to see a Polish movie, browse in East Berlin bookstores (quite different from those in Tübingen and Weingarten; one of the most prominent books for sale was the "catechism" book for children in preparation for the *Jugendweihe*, the state-enforced confirmation) and have a cup of coffee in a people's restaurant, The Warsaw, on the Stalin Allée. One of my most prized souvenirs of the days in Berlin is a snapshot taken by a persuasive commercial photographer on the grounds of the famous *Weihnachtsmarkt* in East Berlin. Under glittering neon lights which spell *Friedens-Weihnacht* are Hans-Jürgen Boyke and myself in the arms of a large white polar bear, identifiable as a human being only by the leather shoes on his feet. In West Berlin I had my first ride in one of the tiny Isetta cars that are becoming so popular there. I felt like something from outer space when the whole glass-bubble-like front and top lifted off for us to get in.

A very impressive evening was the one which I spent with the Humboldt SG in East Berlin when they voted for their new *Vertrauensstudenten*. All of the talk about free elections for the people of the DDR came to my mind during the service which was held in the *Marienkirche*. This is the church which is the headquarters for both Bishop Dibelius and Probst Gruber.

Never before had I seen voting carried on within the framework of a worship service; in a situation other than East Berlin it might have looked terribly "pious", but instead this was reverent and sobering. First the student pastor preached a short, appropriate sermon, then the voting took place, with three students acting as clerks while approximately 200 students came to the front to cast their ballots. While the ballots were being counted there was an organ concert, and after the final results were announced a group

of about 125 students remained to form a large half circle around the altar and receive Holy Communion together, with each student giving the bread and wine to the student next to him until all had partaken.

The other experience which gave me insight into the situation for students in the DDR was the small working conference attended by forty-five students from most of the major East German universities. The main speaker was Professor Künneth from Erlangen University, author of the recent book, *Politik zwischen Dämon und Gott* (Politics between the Devil and God).

Even though there were differences of opinion, most pointedly over the question of whether the communist state is a difference in *degree* or a difference in *quality* from other forms of government, his contribution proved to be very fruitful, and he was personally received in a very warm spirit as one who understood their problems profoundly. The most significant word which I was introduced to that weekend, thanks to a very fine translator, was *Ermessensfrage*, a word in current vogue in East Germany today, meaning an ethical action which one must take somewhere between the two poles of acting on principle and acting out of expediency. It is used to describe many of the daily decisions which Christians must make in the Soviet zone today and which are often made in different ways by different people.

Recent incidents in the SGs at Jena and Leipzig were reported to the whole group and there was discussion about whether or not a new phase of difficulties for the SG was beginning. Bassarak was not convinced this was the case, but events since Christmas would seem to indicate that this may be more true than they expected. The pastoral task which Bassarak has in all of this is a heavy one.

Finis

The differences in life in East and West Germany appeared more obvious to me than the similarities. It is no easy task for the ESGiD to remain *one* when both East and West must minister to the peculiarities of their particular situations. Despite this they realize their need for one another. It is timely that the Federation General Committee for 1956 can meet in this divided country, and that the unity of the ESGiD, which has its deepest reality only as a unity in Christ, can be one of the witnesses to our theme, Jesus Christ the Reconciler.

BOOK REVIEWS

HISTORY OF THE WORLD'S ALLIANCE OF YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS, by C. P. Shedd and others. SPCK, London, 1955. 746 pp.

This book contains a wealth of general and detailed documentation on the objectives, methods and expansion of one of the most significant Christian world movements of our time. It reveals also its influence on the ecumenical vision and achievement within Christendom. Formative years — Expanding vision — In the midst of turmoil: these are the three parts of this history which covers more than one hundred years.

Among the many who played a leading part from the time of the movement's beginning in 1855 with 15,000 members in Europe and 20,000 in North America, until 1955 when it has a total membership of 4,000,000 in all continents, let me mention George Williams of London, and Henri Dunant of Geneva, who contributed most to shape its early years, and John R. Mott of the United States, who was its dominant figure during the last fifty.

The roots of the YMCA are traced back two to three centuries before its actual formative years. The World's movement came into shape under the influence of the revivalism of the early nineteenth century, as a distinct lay movement with the main objective of common Bible study and prayer, led for young people by young men. Yet from the start it had a real concern for the social problems of their environment.

The first international conference, held in Paris in 1855, adopted a Basis which remains today the common treasure and objective of the world-wide Alliance: "unity in regarding Jesus Christ as their God and Saviour" — unity in aim, but variety of organization and methods of action recognized in the national Associations.

Together with the growth and extension of the work and the bonds of fellowship, periods of divergences are honestly recalled. The chapter entitled "Stormy Weather", which concerns the early years of the present century, is significant, with its pages on "progress through differences" and also on the critical years at the close of the first world war.

The landmarks of this history are the twenty world conferences which followed the one in Paris in 1855 up to the recent jubilee

conference held one hundred years later, again in Paris. The expansion of the movement, the development in different fields — student work, boys' work, rural efforts, concerns in industry and labour, in international and inter-racial problems, striking service rendered to prisoners of war, displaced persons and refugees — are all well described. They were made possible by the special attention given to the training of leadership and the careful choice of necessary specialists. Significant also is the renewed emphasis of recent years on Bible study.

Some interesting pages are devoted to relationships with other world Christian organizations, the Amsterdam Youth Conference in 1939, and closer cooperation with its sister movement, the World's YWCA.

Anxious to remain true to the initial objective of the scattered and modest Protestant Associations of its origin; bound together, today as earlier, by the annual week of prayer, the World's YMCA, as described in this history, with its manifold activities, the diversity of its national and local units, its constituency including members of most Christian denominations and confessions, or even belonging to no church, makes a deep impression on the reader. This is a valuable reference book, recommended to the headquarters of every national Student Christian Movement within the WSCF.

H.-L. HENRIOD.

THEY WON'T LIE DOWN. Three Plays by Stuart B. Jackman.
SCM Press, 5/-, 128 pp.

Many ministers have been driven by the lack of good religious drama to write their own plays, but mercifully few of them have ever been published. The theology may be impeccable, but home-made plays are usually characterized by a complete lack of theatre sense, a lack which copious stage directions only accentuate.

Mr. Jackman is a Congregational minister in Pretoria, but from a mere reading of his plays, it is obvious that he is not one of the ministers pilloried in the first paragraph. From his introduction it is clear that no one can tell him anything about the wretchedness of much religious drama. The motive behind his own writing is the need to bridge the "immense gap between the unconvincing nativity play and the poetic but inaccessible artistry of Fry and Eliot... and so help people to gain a new insight into the beauty and power and meaning of worship".

The welter of unconvincing nativity plays which exist (certainly in Britain) make it almost impossible for the audience to get past

the pretty angels, the badly made-up kings, the anachronistic shepherds, to any living communion with God.

In his first play of the three, "The Backyard Miracle", Mr. Jackman tries to capture something of the contemporaneity of the Incarnation. He chooses a modern setting, an overcrowded hotel with the Holy Family offstage in the garage. The manager of the hotel is genuinely twentieth century, even if the imagination boggles a little at Melchior as "a lecturer in political history at London". Nevertheless once the jump has been made, the conversation runs convincingly, and the hotelier's conversion with the help of Balthasar, the African, is both moving and without embarrassment.

The second play, called "The Prototype", is about Lazarus. The author administers a series of shocks to his audience, an essential and admirable dramatic device, but unfortunately one of the shocks has such disturbing theological ramifications and implications that the balance of the play is upset for any but the theologically illiterate.

The disturbance is caused by the fact that Lazarus returns from the grave a half-wit. He is not fully restored until Christ is risen, and then he dies again immediately.

To state it bluntly like this does no justice to the evident theological and dramatic skill. But the "message" of this play is shouted down by clamorous questions which the author did not intend to raise, and which therefore destroy the unity and purpose of the play.

The third play, "The Blind Man", based on the Gospel account of Christ healing the blind beggar, is rather diffuse in what it has to say. The audience is introduced to devoted parents, gossiping neighbours, a pompous vicar, and finally a magistrate who is a rather stagey version of a totalitarian police state inquisitor.

This is perhaps the least satisfactory of the three plays, but all of them are refreshing in their attempt to throw off the stifling conventions of so much bad religious drama.

In the admirable introduction to the plays, the point is made that staging can be of the simplest where there is an effective lighting plot. All these plays are designed to be done in church with, therefore, no scenery or curtains and the minimum of props.

Whether these plays can speak to those outside the Christian tradition is hard to say (though the *London Observer* reviewed them well after their first production in England), but it is obvious that they bring health and salvation to the complacent consumer of religious charades.

FRANCES GLENDENNING.

ANGEL UNAWARES, by Stuart B. Jackman. SCM Press, London, 1956. 4s.

Persons interested in the use of drama in factories, working-class parishes, and other special evangelism projects, should note this one-act play about a labour leader who is torn between communist and Christian loyalties during a strike. It is so much in a British idiom that it would require considerable adaptation for use elsewhere. P. R.

DAS ALTESTENAMT DER CHRISTLICHEN GEMEINDE IM LICHT DER HEILIGEN SCHRIFT, by Wilhelm Michaelis. Berchtold Haller Verlag, Berne, Switzerland. Sw. frs. 13.50.

In all the Reformed churches there is much talk these days of the restoration of the eldership to its full importance. Much of the work in the "Tell Scotland" movement, for instance, devolves on the elders of the church, and over-worked ministers everywhere realize that the "one-man system" is wrong, and that the elders also should take their full part in the pastoral oversight of the parish, and even in preaching and teaching.

This book on the office of the elder is inspired by the desire to encourage a better understanding of the duties of the eldership, and a fuller realization in practice of these duties, by means of a detailed examination of the biblical evidence. The author begins with the eldership in the Old Testament and the synagogue eldership in the time of Jesus. Then follows an exhaustive examination of the New Testament evidence, which will be of great use and interest to anyone making a serious study of the origins of the ministry. There is a tendency perhaps to include more than is legitimate under the office of the elder (presbyter) ; for example, the author suggests that perhaps the seven of Acts 6 were not deacons, but rather elders. Ample evidence is given in support of the identification of elders and bishops in the New Testament Church, and almost every word in the New Testament denoting oversight in pastoral care is brought under examination.

There follows a very interesting and practical section on the duties of the elders in the New Testament — Word and teaching, pastoral work, oversight, prayer over the sick, conduct of public worship, celebration of the Lord's Supper, and "external relations" (including stimulation of the congregation to missionary enterprise).

The last section of the book, "A Look into the Present", relates all this New Testament evidence to the needs of today. Several very

good and useful recommendations are made here. The "one-man system" of many modern parishes is attacked: far better is the "collegiate" system of the New Testament; churches then always had a plurality of elders, who could share the work and help each other. Elders should be ready to be active in the preaching of the Word and in teaching, and not merely in "ruling". Arrangements should be made for giving them some sort of training in their duties. And there is no reason why women should not become elders, and take their full part in the oversight of the Church. Michaelis urges progressive "equalizing" of the offices of minister and elder; for him the chief difference between the two seems to be that the minister is a full-time elder, while the elder is only a part-time minister.

It is on this point of the relation of minister to elder that many people will differ with the author, for the ministry, and not just the eldership, stems from the New Testament presbyterate. Is the modern eldership in the Reformed churches the same as that of the New Testament in anything but name? It is difficult, unless one is a Calvin, to equate contemporary ministries with those of the New Testament, and draw conclusions about how they should be exercised, while neglecting all the intervening developments. Thus it would seem to a non-Swiss Presbyterian that Michaelis says too little about either ordination or the Lord's Supper. He says that the New Testament elders were "laymen" (p. 159). But if so, what is ordination? They could celebrate the Lord's Supper — but should contemporary elders do this? Though he finds modern equivalents for all the other duties of New Testament elders, except, curiously enough, anointing the sick (what about the ministry of healing?), Michaelis does not discuss this question. (The Church of South India movement towards an unpaid, part-time ministry is interesting here, but the CSI presbyter, though part-time, is not a layman, and therefore not an elder in Michaelis' sense.)

So far as the pastoral work of the local church is concerned, and for detailed examination of the evidence, this book is most helpful. But ecumenically it is perhaps a little disappointing, and those outside the Reformed tradition will find some strange things here. For a Presbyterian minister, living in North India as a member of a church which includes Congregationalists, looking forward to eventual union with Anglicans, and to the enjoyment of full relationship with the bishops and presbyters and deacons of the Church of South India, there is here no clear line of guidance through the maze of orders. But the stimulation to exegesis of the New Testament makes the book most rewarding to study.

ROBIN BOYD.

REDISCOVERING THE CHURCH, A Study Guide for J.E.L. Newbigin's book, *THE HOUSEHOLD OF GOD*, by Eugene S. Wehrli, 1955. Eden Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., 31 pp. \$0.20.

Bishop Newbigin's recent book is undoubtedly one of the best essays on church unity which one can read. While usually deploring the ought-to-be-in-every-bookshelf type of review, I believe that *The Household of God* merits just such unqualified commendation to anyone seriously interested in problems of unity. Its arguments for the urgency of the Church's effective mission and manifest unity are based upon solid biblical exegesis, sure-footed theology, and personal experience in the development of the Church of South India. So my first advice is, read Newbigin's book, then read it a second time.

Knowing the need for Christian students to develop a sound understanding of the why and whereto of church unity, I rejoice in the publication of Wehrli's study guide and hope it will be widely used in study groups. Its best effect will be to make students read, ponder and discuss the book by Newbigin. The guide has the merit of directing attention to relevant New Testament passages about the Church. It puts into words the questions which are implicit in the text and provides a small amount of helpful commentary. Its weakness, I believe, lies in the questions offered for group discussion, which are often too pointless to provoke much thought. It strikes me, for example, that to ask, "Is the Church human or divine?" is like asking, "Are people male or female?" The author might have tried more carefully to imagine what kind of answers these questions will provoke, since a major value of a study guide is the force and clarity with which it presents basic questions. Even so, this guide will be used to very good advantage by student groups, if they follow diligently the biblical passages and the pages of Newbigin.

It is worthy of note that this booklet on unity was prepared by the United Student Fellowship, which is a "fore-taste" of the union of Congregational Christian Churches and the Evangelical and Reformed Church which is to be consummated in 1957.

J. ROBERT NELSON.